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## PREFACE.

Most of those writers on Philology to whose works I am indebted are mentioned either in the text or notes of this book, and I have here only to express my especial obligations to the writings of Bopp, Schleicher, Corssen, Curtius, and Bücheler, and to several valuable essays in Kuhn's Zeitschrift by Ebel, Grassmann, Dietrich, Walter, and others.

I have also to thank Dr. C. Lottner, Professor of Sanskrit in the University of Dublin, for helping me in the revision of the proof-sheets, and for many valuable suggestions supplied during the progress of the work.

The abbreviations occurring in the text do not require much explanation, and the following only require to be noticed:-

| A. S., . . Anglo-Saxon. | Gr., . . . . Greek. |
| :--- | :--- |
| Ch. Sl., . . Church-Slavonic. | Ir., . . . . Irish. |
| E., . . . English. | It., . . . . Italian. |
| Fr., . . . . French. | I. E., . . . Indo-European. |
| G., . . . German. | Kel., . . . Keltic. |
| O. H. G., . Old High German. | L., . . . . Latin. |
| Goth., . . . Gothic. | O. L., . . . Old Latin. |

Lith., . . . Lithuanian.
O. N., . . . Old Norse.
O., . . . . . Oscan.
O. O., . . . Old Oscan.
O. P., . . . Old Prussian.
O. S., . . . Old Saxon.

Skr., . . . . Sanskrit.

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sp., . . . . Spanish. } \\
& \text { U., . . . . . Umbrian. } \\
& \text { O. U., . . . Old Umbrian. } \\
& \text { Wall., . . . Wallachian. } \\
& \text { W., . . . . Welsh. } \\
& \text { Z., . . . . . Zend. }
\end{aligned}
$$

Sanskrit and Zend nouns are generally given in their crude forms, except when the case-ending is separated by a hyphen from the stem, or when the sign of equality is added, as in Skr. as'vas = L. equus. Curtius Essay "Zur Chronologie der Indo-Germanischen Sprachforschung," appears in the fifth volume, "der Abhandlungen der Philologisch-historischen Classe der Königl. Sächsischen Gesellschaft der Wissenchaften."

I refer to the second series of Max Müller's Lectures on the Science of Language, as Max Müller, Vol. ir. K. Z. stands for Kuhn's "Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete des Deutschen, Griechischen und Lateinischen."

I have been delayed in the publication of this book for more than a year through a severe attack of illness.

The Second Volume of this Work will, I hope, be ready for publication in January, 1872.

WILLIAM HUGH FERRAR.

33, Trinity College, Dublin, September 1, 1869.
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COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR.

## CHAPTER I.

## The General Alphabet.*

§. 1. The physiology of the human voice is the true basis upon which all inquiries into the origin of language and the mutual connexion of languages should be built.
§. 2. All that the human ear is sensible of may be divided into noises and sounds. Examples of the former are the howling of the wind, and the splashing of water. Sounds, on the other hand, are produced by musical instruments or the human voice. Noises are caused by rapidly changing and irregular impulses communicated to the air; sounds, by its periodic vibrations. The human voice, which is only a stream of air, emitted from the lungs, becomes sound by the vibration of the vocal chords, which thus put the air passing through them into a state of vibration.
§. 3. An exact description of the vocal organs is not part of my present plan. For such a description I refer the reader

[^0]to any good book on anatomy ; merely adding here, that the vocal organs may be said to consist of the lungs, which by being dilated or compressed act like a pair of bellows, the windpipe, the larynx, and the upper cavities of the pharynx, mouth, and nose. The larynx, the true organ of voice, is placed at the upper part of the windpipe. It is narrow and cylindrical below, but broad above, where it presents the form of a triangular box. Its cavity is traversed by an elastic membrane, which is divided into two parts, called the vocal chords, by a narrow fissure called the rima glottidis. When sound is produced, the vocal chords almost touch, and their edges at the same time vibrate, rapidly for high, and slowly for low notes. We see, then, that the vocal organs form a wind instrument, in which the vibrating apparatus consists of. the vocal chords.
§. 4. In the impression made by a sound on the ear three things can be distinguished-loudness, pitch, and quality. The loudness depends on the amplitude of the oscillations of the vibrating body. The pitch depends on the duration of these oscillations. Now, notes of the same loudness and the same pitch can be produced by different musical instruments, and also by the human voice. The same note, however, of the violin differs from that of the trumpet, and that from the same note of the voice, and so on. This difference had already been supposed to depend solely on the form of the vibrations of the air, as it could not depend on either their amplitude or duration. This has now been proved directly by Helmholtz. The quality, therefore, is due solely to the form of the vibrations of the air.

## §. 5. The Elements of Language.

The phonetic elements ( $\sigma$ го८zะia) are threefold-vowels ( $\phi \omega \nu \eta \in \nu \tau a$ ), breathings, and consonants ( $\sigma \dot{v} \mu \phi \omega \nu a$ ). The consonants are divided, according to their duration, into mutes and
semivowels, these latter including liquids (í $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \rho \dot{a}$ ), nasals, and sibilants (flatus) ; according to their hardness, into surds (sharp, stosslaute, tenues, $\psi i \lambda \alpha ́$, Skr. aghosha, vivâras'vâsâghosha), and sonants (blunt, drucklaute, mediæ, $\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma a$, Skr. goshavant, samvâranâdaghosha) ; and according to their aspiration into aspirated ( $\delta a \sigma$ źa, Skr. mahâprâna) and unaspirated (Skr. alpaprâna). In Sanskrit the term $\hat{u} s h m a n$ is also applied to the sibilants and $h$, spars'a to the mutes and nasals, and antahsth $\hat{a}$ to $y, r, l, v$, as intermediate between the former and the latter.

The medir differ from the tenues in this, that in the former the glottis is somewhat narrowed to enable it to sound.

The mediæ were so called because they were pronounced by the Alexandrian grammarians with more aspiration than the tenues, and with less than the aspirates. To us, however, and most probably to the Greeks of the classical period, $g$ is as little aspirated as $k$.

The term consonant means "sounding along with," and, as Ellis writes, "is said to be given to these letters because they have no sound of their own, but sound* with vowels." If, however, we consider $s, f, r, \& c$., to be consonants, all consonants do not require the aid of a vowel to enable us to pronounce them; for we can pronounce the nasals, liquids, and sibilants without the help of any vowel. The Sanskrit name for a consonant is vyañg'ana (Sâv. 5: 25), from vyañg', to make clear.

The Arabic grammarians call a vowel, motion, and a consonant, a barrier, because in forming vowels the voice is not interrupted, but only modified by the position of the tongue and lips, whereas in forming consonants the voice is stopped at certain fixed positions. Brücke, on the other hand, considers the vowel-signs to be properly marks of rest, and the consonantal signs to be marks of motion, because the

* Ellis remarks (p. 57), that this definition reads very like a bull.
latter signifies both the closing of the barrier and the opening of $i t$.

The consonantal signs were originally marks for syllables, as the Devanâgarî and Semitic alphabets prove.

## §. 6. The Vowels.

Vowels are composed of vocalized breath. The difference between the various vowels is due to the form of the vibrations of the air emitted from the lungs, which vibrations depend upon the form of the buccal tubes.*

The three primary vowels are $A, l$, and $U$, pronounced as in German or Italian.

In forming $A$ the mouth assumes a position gradually widening itself from the guttural point, like a funnel. The lips are in this position wide, and the tongue lies flat in the mouth.
$U$ is formed by rounding the lips, so as to leave the opening between them as narrow as possible, and by drawing down the tongue, so that the cavity of the mouth is enlarged as much as possible. The mouth in this position is like a bottle without a neck.
$I$ is formed by narrowing the lips and raising the tongue towards the hard palate. Thus a bottle with a narrow neck is formed, the body of which is in the throat, while the neck lies between the hard palate and the upper surface of the tongue. The length of this neck, according to Helmholtz, is six centimètres.

All the other vowels are formed between these three pri-

* "In der That sind die Vocale der menschlichen Stimme Töne membranoser Zungen, nämlich der Stimmebänder, deren Ansatzrohr, nämlich die Mundhöhle, verschiedene Weite, Länge, und Stimmung erhalten kann, so dass dadurch bald dieser, bald jener Theilton des Klanges verstärkt wird." Helmholtz, p. 163.
mary ones. The following tabular view of them is that given by Brücke :-


In forming o we open the lips wider and elevate the tongue more than in forming $u$. In proceeding from $a$ to $i$ we gradually change the buccal tubes from the $a$ to the $i$ position; and similarly in proceeding from $a$ to $u$. In forming $u^{i}$ we give the lips the $u$, and the tongue the $i$ position; while in forming $i^{u}$ the lips take the $i$, and the tongue the $u$ position. In $u^{i}$ the length of the canal, which was six centimètres in $i$, is now eight (Helmholtz, p. 170).
$a$ is long in E. farm, calm, and short in E. Sam.
$i$ is long in E. wheel, ravine, and short in E. knit.
$u$ is long in E. fute, fool, and short in E. full.
$a^{e}$ is the German $\ddot{a}$, the French $\hat{e}$. It is short in the Cockney pronunciation of man, fat.
$a^{0}$ is long in E. nought, water, and short in E. hot, not.
$e^{a}$ is the German $e$ in echt, the French $\circlearrowright$.
$a^{o e}$ occurs in Fr, veuve, soeur, peur.
$o^{a}$ is heard in the Fr. encore.
$e$ is long in G. ewig, E. hay, and short in G. werden.
$e^{0}$ is a common sound in the Wallachian language. Brücke says that it is heard in G. zwölf.
$o^{e}$ is the G. 0 in Konig, Fr. peu.
$o$ is long in E. ago, and short in G. sonne.
$i^{u}$ is heard in G. Myrte and Physik. It is the Slavonic hard $i$. This sound is of Tataric origin, and traces of it are still found in the Dravidic languages of Southern India.
$u^{i}$ is the G. $\ddot{u}$, long in Thür, and short in dürr. It is
the Fr. $u$ in sur and sur. It is also the Dutch $u u$ and the Scotch ui.

Lepsius inserts another vowel sound between $a^{e}$ and $a^{o}$, which, he says, is heard in the E.but, son.

## §. 7. The Original Vowel.

In addition to the vowels noticed in the last section, we have another vowel, called variously, the indefinite, or neutral, or original vowel, Urlaut, Urvocal. This is a sound that exists in all languages, and from it, according to Ellis, all the other vowels are derived. Willis says that it 'seems to be the natural vowel of the reed.' All unaccented vowels in our European languages have a tendency to return to this sound ; e. g. E. beggar, nation, Paddington (for -town), G. lieben, Fr. tenir. This vowel sound is formed by leaving the tongue in its most natural position, opening the mouth easily, and emitting vocal breath. Lepsius says that this sound comes among the clear sounding vowels next to $a^{o e}$, but that it is capable of various shades, sometimes approaching $a$, sometimes $e, i, o, u$, being distinguished from all these by the absence of that clear resonance, which is lost by either partially closing or shutting the mouth. The French $e$ muet and the Welsh $y$ approach this sound very nearly. Brücke considers that Lepsius is wrong in stating, that this vowel is inherent in all soft fricatives and nasal explosives,* for the indistinct vowel sound here is merely the tone of the voice. Moreover, the only actual examples of the amalgamation of a vowel and consonant are $u w$ and $i y$.

Max Müller is wrong in supposing that we hear this sound in E. el-m, mar-sh; for, in proceeding from $l$ to $m$, or $r$ to $s h$, we do not require to interpose any vowel.

[^1]This indistinct vowel, when combined with $r$ and $l$, forms the two Sanskrit vowels $r$ and $l$. This Sanskrit vowel $r$ differs from E. $r$, as heard in her, steward, in this, that it is pronounced at the cerebral,* whereas the E. $r$ is pronounced at the guttural point of the mouth.

## §. 8. The Nasal Vowels.

The nasalization of the vowels is produced by allowing the air to vibrate in the nasal cavities as well as in the mouth. The air need not pass through the nose, for by closing the nose we may increase the nasal twang.

Nasalization is an alteration solely within the vowel itself, no consonantal element being brought into play. This, as Lepsius points out ("Standard Alphabet," p. 9), was rightly understood by the Indian grammarians, who express the nasalization by a vowel-like sign, viz., a dot over the letter. It is theoretically possible to give all the vowels the nasal twang, but few reccive it. Miklosich remarks that in all the languages known to him, only $a, a^{e}, o^{e}$, and $o$ were nasalized. Ellis says that the Portuguese have both' a nasal $i$ and a nasal urvocal.

## §. 9. Diphthongs.

When two vowels follow each other so rapidly as to melt into one sound, we obtain a diphthong. Now, we know that $a$ is formed at a point in the mouth before $i$ and $u$, and therefore it alone of the three primary vowels can form a true diphthongal base. Moreover, as $e$ and $o$ are also formed in the mouth farther back than $i$ and $u$, they may serve as bases. We can make $a$ both long and short. We have, therefore, eight proper diphthongs, which are moreover capable of receiving different shades of pronunciation.

[^2]We see at once that we cannot form any proper diphthongs with $i$ and $u$ as bases; for if we try to pronounce $i a$ and $u a$ very rapidly we do not form diphthongs, but merely the syllables $y a$ and $w a$. In Welsh we find the improper diphthongs $i a$ and $u a$, and in French we find improper $u$ diphthongs frequently as in oui, which is not pronounced as we in English.

§. 10. The Breathings.

These are classed by some writers among the consonants, as by Lepsius, who gives them the name Faucal,* and classifies them thus:-

## Explosive fortis, Arabic \&, ain.

Explosive lenis, Arabic Hamzeh, Greek Spiritus Lenis.
Fricative fortes, Arabic て, hha, and English h, as in hand, which is not as strong an aspiration as $h h$.

There can be no nasal breathing, for the canal of the nose is closed during the formation of a Faucal sound.

Ellis and others separate the breathings from the consonants, and form them into a distinct class.

The pure aspirate, however, as I believe, does not belong to any special organ, though it appears to have some connexion with the gutturals. Accordingly, while we find $h$ representing frequently an original $g h$, we sometimes find it developed from an original $d h$ and $b h$.

## §. 11. The Consonants. $\dagger$

These are produced under the following conditions:-
A. No air is allowed to pass into the nasal cavities, and the canal of the mouth is closed at some definite point. Thus are formed the Explosive sounds, both tenues and medice.

[^3]B. The air is still prevented entering the nasal cavities; but, in place of closing the canal of the mouth at any point, a narrow passage is left, so that the air comes forth with a sound of friction. Thus are formed the Fricatives, including $h, y, v$ and the Sibilants. The $L$-sounds are fricatives; but they differ from the other letters of this class in this, that the passage for the emission of the air does not lie in the centre of the canal of the mouth, but on each side, between the edges of the tongue and the grinders.
C. The nasal cavities are still closed, but some portion of the canal of the mouth is made to vibrate, thus causing the vibration of the air passing out. Thus arise the $R$-sounds.
D. The mouth is closed, and the nasal cavities are open. Thus we have the Resonants, or Nasals. The nasals and vowels are the sounds easiest to be heard from a distance. Thus words such as Mamma, mine, no, can be heard very far away.
§. 12. The four classes are divided again under three heads, according to those parts of the canal of the mouthrthat approach each other.
I. The under lip may approach the upper lip or the upper teeth. These sounds are the Labials. They are the most constant sounds in all languages.
II. The fore part of the tongue may approach the teeth or the palate. These sounds are the Dentals and Cerebrals. Bühler has demonstrated that the existence of the cerebrals in Sanskrit is not due to Dravidian influences, but that they were independently developed in that language. The Arabic linguals differ from the Sanskrit cerebrals solely in this, that in the latter the tongue is more contracted than in the former. The name cerebral is not quite correct, but its use has become so general that it is better to retain it. The Sanskrit name for these letters is mûrddhanya, from mûrddhan, which means the highest point in the roof of the palate, and not the brain.

It is absurd to say that any letter is pronounced in the brain (cerebrum).
III. The middle or hinder part of the tongue may approach the palate. Thus we have the Palatals and Gutturals (Skr. g'ihvâmûlîya). The term guttural* is not exactly correct, for these letters are not produced in the guttur, but by contact between the tongue and the soft palate. By pushing this point of contact forwards to the hard palate, we get the palatals. These palatal sounds have a tendency to assume a shade of $y$, which frequently becomes independent, and developes itself into a full $y$. This is easily accounted for by the fact that in the palatals the tongue is raised very nearly into the $y$-position. Thus we can explain the fact that original gutturals often become sibilants; for the guttural $k$ became the palatal ; this again became $k y$, this $t y$, this $t s$, and sometimes $s$. For example, the L. cantus became E. chant (palatal tenuis), and Fr. chant (palatal sibilant); L. canis, Fr. chien; L. quatuor, Skr. k'atvâr ; L. que, Skr. k'a; Gr. кoï $\lambda o v$, L. coelum, It. cielo; L. caseus, E. cheese; L. causa, Fr. chose.

This tendency of the palatals to develope $y$ after themselves also explains how an original guttural sometimes becomes a dental; thus ris has been developed from kis the groundform of which was kvas, whence Skr. $k a-s$, Goth. hras, L. quis; similarly $\tau \varepsilon \sigma \sigma a \rho \varepsilon s$ is derived from an original kvatvâras, whence come L. quatuor, Skr. k'atvâr, Lith. keturi, \&c.
"Such transitions," writes Lepsius ("Stand. Alph.," p. 72), "in the history of languages never take place suddenly, but always gradually. It is a very common phenomenon that the explosive letters first produce the corresponding fricative sounds behind them, and afterwards pass entirely into them,

[^4]and that at the same time the gutturals advance constantly towards the anterior part of the mouth."

## §. 13 . The Labials.

## A. The Explosives.

The tenuis $p\left(p^{1}\right)$ is formed by simple contact of the lips: it is a surd consonant, for the glottis is wide open. The media $b\left(b^{1}\right)$ is formed similarly, except that now the glottis is narrowed. In modern Greek, where $\beta$ is pronounced as $\nu$, the sound $b$ is expressed by $\mu \pi$, where $\mu$ merely tells us that the glottis is now contracted; similarly $\nu \tau$ is used to express the sound $d$. Thus, barber would be written $\mu \pi a ́ \rho \rho \pi \tau \rho$, and dreadful $\nu \tau \rho \varepsilon i \tau \phi o v \lambda$, for $\nu \tau \rho \varepsilon \nu \tau \phi o v \lambda$.

We can form a second $p\left(p^{2}\right)$ by bringing the upper lip and lower teeth together.

## B. The Fricatives.

F is formed by bringing the under lip towards the upper tecth $\left(f^{2}\right)$; or by bringing the lips towards each other $\left(f^{1}\right)$. $V$ is related to $f$, exactly as $b$ is to $p . \quad F^{* 2}$ is the $f$ in life; $v^{2}$ is the $v$ in live. Brücke says that we find $v^{1}$ in G. quelle, and $v^{2}$ in G. wie; but Ellis separates the sounds of the G. $w$ and E. $v$ from each other. The former he writes, ' $v$, and thus describes its formation-" the lips are brought into the position for $w$, and the contact at the edge is slackened, while the inner surfaces are brought close together and flattened." The E. $w$, he says, arose from a cross between this ' $v$, and the Fr. $u$. No other European language possesses the E. $w$, and hence it has been supposed by some that this $w$ is properly the vowel $u$. But this is wrong; for we can make this sound surd in wheel, which; and the fact that the words woo and wood are monosyllabic proves that $w$ is a true consonant.

## C. The $R$-sound.

If we place the lips in the $p^{1}$ position and then let them vibrate, we form two sounds, the one surd, and the other sonant, which are related to each other as $p$ to $b$. We find this labial $r$ in the Kretan $\tau \rho \varepsilon$ for $\tau \mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon}=$ Skr. tvâm, in $\delta \varepsilon \delta \rho o \iota \kappa \omega \dot{s}$ for $\delta \varepsilon \delta$ Foık $\omega$ s, unless $\delta \varepsilon \delta \rho o \sigma^{\kappa} \omega \varsigma$, i. e. $\delta \varepsilon \delta о \rho \kappa \kappa$ śs, be the correct reading, in Kr. $\rho \dot{\imath} \gamma \boldsymbol{\gamma}(\sigma \iota \omega ́ \pi \alpha)$ for $\sigma \rho \iota \gamma a$ from $\sigma \mathcal{F} \iota \gamma a$, and perhaps in
 root. This $r$ only appears in Greek in the Kretan dialect. In the following Latin words $r$ has perhaps been developed out of an original $v:-\mathrm{L}$. cras = Skr. s'vas, L. creta beside Skr. s'veta (white), L. cresco beside Skr. s'vi (to increase). This interchange of $r$ and $v$ occurs also in some German dialects (see K. Z., vol. xv., p. 320).

## D. The Resonants.

If we close the lips as in $b^{1}$, and allow the air to vibrate in the nasal cavities, we form $m^{1}$. $\mathrm{M}^{2}$ is not used: The nasals are closely connected with the mediæ- $m$ with $b, n$ with $d$, and $\ddot{n}$ with $g$. Hence we find L. Alamma for flä̈ma from flagma; Sp. Inez for Agnes, L. hibernus beside $\chi^{\varepsilon} \mu \varepsilon \rho \iota \nu o ́ s ; ~ L . ~ p u b e r ~$ beside Skr. pumâns. In northern climates the nasals are frequently omitted; as in Ir. coic (quinque), cet (centum), O.N. gêck for gênck.

## §. 14. The Dentals and Cerebrals.

A. The Explosives.

By pressing the fore part of the tongue against the palate and teeth we form a $t$-sound, of which there are four kinds.
$\mathrm{T}^{1}$. Alveolar. The sides of tongue touch the upper grinders, and the point of tongue lies on upper internal gums, thus forming an air-tight receptacle.
$\mathrm{T}^{2}$. Cerebral. The tongue is now convex, and its lower side touches the palate. This $t$ has been called lingual; but I prefer the term cerebral, because the other term is applied in Arabic to a different class of letters, and moreover it does not suffice to distinguish this sound, as all $t$ s are pronounced by means of the tongue.
$\mathrm{T}^{3}$. Dorsal. The tongue is still convex, but its upper side now touches the palate, and its tip rests on lower teeth.

T ${ }^{4}$. Dental. The tongue now merely touches the teeth.
We have four $d \mathrm{~s}$ related to these four $t \mathrm{~s}$ as $b$ is to $p$.

## B. The Fricatives.

We have four ss related to the four $t s$, as $f$ is to $p$, and four $z$ s related to the four $s s$ as $v$ is to $f$.
$S^{1}$ is the Arabic $S a d$, and is nearly the same as the $s$ in E . sin, seal.
$S^{2}$ is a more rushing sound than $s^{1}$.
$S^{3}$ is the sharp hissing $s$ in E. sharp, Fr. chose.
$S^{4}$ is the E. th in thin, the Mod. Gr. $\theta$. This $\theta$ has become $f$ in Russian : this change is easily explained, for the edge of the upper teeth, which in $\theta$ lies between point of tongue and under lip, now merely has to approach the latter.*
$Z^{1}$ is the Arabic $z a$, and is nearly the same as $z$ in E. breeze.
$Z^{3}$ is found in E. pleasure, giraffe, Fr. jeune, according to Lepsius.
$Z^{4}$ is E. th in other, Mod. Gr. \&. In English, when $z^{4}$ is initial, we generally say $d^{4} z^{4}$; and when it is final, $z^{4} s^{4}$ instead of it; thus, for breathe we say breaz $z^{4} s^{4}$, and not $b r e a z^{4}$. In this respect the Spanish pronunciation of $z^{4}$ differs from ours; for final $z^{4}$ in Spanish is always pronounced purely. Neither $s^{4}$ nor $z^{4}$ exists in Sanskrit.

[^5]If in the four $t$-positions we allow an opening to be left at each side of the tongue between its edges and the grinders, we form from the four $t s$ four $\lambda \mathrm{s}$, and from the four $d \mathrm{~s}$ four $l \mathrm{~s}$.
$\mathrm{L}^{1}$ is the common $l$ in E. leave.
$\mathrm{L}^{2}$ is the Vedic $l$.
$\mathrm{L}^{3}$ occurs in $l$ moxillé.
$L^{4}$ is used by those who lisp.
$\mathrm{L}^{1}$ often becomes vocal in English, as in apple, double, which Ellis writes ap'l, \&c. The surd $\lambda^{1}$ is unknown in English, but is very common in Welsh, where it is written $l l$, as in Llangollen. This surd $\lambda^{1}$ takes the place of $l e$ in conversational French, in such words as able, possible, which Englishmen pronounce as $a b ’ l$, \&c. This $l l$ is Ellis' whispered $l$. In his terminology, surd consonants are whispered, and sonant, spoken or voiced. Whisper differs from voice solely in this, that in whispering there is no vibration of the vocal chords, whereas in voice there is.

## C. The $R$-sound.

The alveolar $r$, when sonant, is our common $r$. When surd, it occurs in Welsh, and in French as in tendre. This $\operatorname{surd} r$ is scarcely to be distinguished from $s$, the only difference being a small ripple of the whisper. This accounts for the fact that $s$ and $r$ frequently interchange (Ellis, p. 50).

The Sanskrit grammarians treat $r$ as a cerebral, and therefore deduce it from $d^{2}$; but they are wrong, for it is impossible to make the tongue vibrate from the cerebral position.

As they did not distinguish the alveolar position, they had to treat $r$ as either a dental or a cerebral ; and they chose the latter, probably on account of the point of the tongue being directed upwards (Brücke, p. 42).

## D. The Resonants.

We have four $n \mathrm{~s}$, corresponding to the four $d \mathrm{~s}$, exactly as $m$ to $b$. $\quad N^{3}$ is contained in $n$ mouillé.

## §. 15. The Gutturals and Palatals.

## A. The Explosives.

In forming $k$ the middle or hinder part of the tongue touches the middle or hinder part of the palate, while in forming $t$ the fore part of the tongue touches the fore part of the palate. Hence the articulation of $t$ begins where that of $k$ ends; yet in the cerebral $t$ we may go backwards across the $k$ limit, and still pronounce a $t$. This, however, cannot be done in the case of the dorsal $t$. Two $k$ s may be formed-one on the hard palate ( $k^{1}$ palatale), and one on the soft palate ( $k^{2}$ velare).

The It. ch, in chiesa, chiaro, is formed at the front limit of the hard palate; the Arabic Caf at the hinder limit, and the G. $k$, in wickeln between these two. The $k^{2}$ in G. stock is formed at front limit of soft palate. The Arabic Kaf is formed farther back than any other $k$ sound.
$G^{1}$ and $g^{2}$ are related to $k^{1}$ and $k^{2}$, as $b$ is to $p . \quad G^{1}$ is the It. $g h$ before $i$; the G. $g$ in geben is formed a little farther back than It. $g$, but it is still palatal.

## B. The Fricatives.

In these the stream of air strikes the palate, as in the $s$ sounds it struck the teeth. They are related to the $k$ sounds as $f$ is to $p$.

The palatal flatus, $\chi^{1}$, is the G. ch after $e$ and $i$, as in Recht, $i c h$, and the Mod. Gr. $\chi$ before $i$ as in $\chi$ عip. The initial sound of the E. hew, human very nearly approaches this $\chi^{1}$. This is the whispered form of the $y$ in E. yea, year.

The guttural flatus is the G. ch, after $a, o, u$, the Mod. Gr. $\chi$ before $a, o, v, \omega$.

Another $\chi$ sound, $\chi^{3}$ can be formed so far back that no $k$ sound corresponds to it. This is the Swiss $c h$ in ach, and is common in Arabic.

There are three $y \mathrm{~s}$, related to the three $\chi^{s}$ exactly as $w$ is to $f$.
$Y^{1}$ occurs in E. yea; and $y^{2}$ is the G. $g$ in Tage, Lüge, and the Mod. Gr. $\gamma$ before $a, \boldsymbol{o}, \boldsymbol{w}$.

## C. The $R$-sound.

If we make the uvula vibrate, we form the uvular $r$. This is distinguished from the dental $r$ by the fact, that in the latter it is the tip of the tongue that vibrates. The $l$ and $r$ sounds are commonly called Trills. They differ in this, that in the $r$ s the stream of air is periodically interrupted, but in the $/ \mathrm{s}$ there are no interruptions, but merely oscillations produced in the emitted air.

## D. The Resonants.

We form two es $\left(\nu^{1}, \nu^{2}\right)$, related to $g^{1}$ and $g^{2}$ as $m$ is to $b$. $\nu^{1}$ occurs in G. Bengel; $\nu^{2}$ in G.Wange.

The French $n$ in un, en, is now merely a sign of the nasalization of the preceding vowel, and is therefore no consonant at all. From a comparison, however, with Latin and Italian, we see that it has been developed out of an $n$ sound which was neither $\nu^{1}$ nor $\nu^{2}$, but $\nu^{3}$.

## § 16. The Aspirates.

These are classed by some writers among the fricatives, by others among the explosives. They are, according to Lepsius, "those explosive sounds which are pronounced with a simple but audible breath." Three different methods of pronouncing the tenues aspirate have been proposed:-(1), the tenuis and spiritus asper may be pronounced separately; (2), the spiritus asper may be changed into the corresponding flatus, and then $p h, t h, k h$, become $p f, t s$ and $k c h$, respectively;
(3), the tenuis and the spiritus asper may melt into one sound. The first of these methods is said to prevail at present among the Brahmans ; it is compared to the pronunciation of $p h$, th, and $k h$, in the English words haphazard, anthill, inkhorn; but this is incorrect-for in these words the tenuis and the spiritus asper belong to different syllables, whereas in Sanskrit they belong always to the same syllable.

The medice are aspirated by allowing the spiritus lenis to be heard immediately after the explosion. In Sanskrit the mediæ aspiratæ were always pronounced as one sound; for we find words beginning with the following combinations, ghn, dhm, ghr, \&c.

We must carefully remember that the Sanskrit $h$ does not form part of the aspirated tenuis; for it is a sonant letter, and therefore cannot form part of the aspirated tenuis, which is surd.

The original aspirates in process of time lost their true character, and gradually changed into other sounds. Thus, in Greek, they became the corresponding fricatives; e. g. $\chi$, which was originally a tenuis aspirata, became the fricatives, $\chi^{1}$ and $\chi^{2}$.

## §. 17. Concrete Consonants.

These are those sounds which are formed by the vocal organs being placed at the same time in two different consonantal positions. The G. sch and the Fr. $j$ are concrete consonants. These concrete sounds are perfectly distinct from groups of consonants, such as $x, \psi$, which Brücke calls compositce. The G. sch is equivalent to [ $\left.s^{1} \chi^{1}\right]$ : we first place the vocal organs in the $\chi^{2}$-position, and then bend the tongue upwards into the $s^{1}$-position. The It. $c$ in ciceri is equivalent to $t^{1}\left[s^{1} \chi^{2}\right]$, while the E. ch in church is more nearly $t^{1}\left[s^{1} \chi^{3}\right]$. The Fr. $j$ in jamais is related to the G. sch as $b$ is to $p$. It is therefore $\left[z^{1} y^{2}\right]$. The E. $j$ in $j o y$ is similarly related to the

It. $c$ in ciceri. It is therefore $d^{1}\left[z^{1} y^{2}\right]$. Max Müller differs from these views of Bruicke; he says that ch in church does not consist of two consonants, but merely of half $t$ and half $s h$, and therefore that it is merely equivalent to one whole consonant.


The Indo-European Language.
§. 18. THis is the name given to that language from which the whole family of the Indo-European languages are derived, and which therefore stand to it in the same relation as the Romance languages do to the Latin. As we could approximate to the roots and grammatical forms of the Latin language, even if we had no monuments of it, from a comparison of the roots and grammatical forms at present existing in the Romance languages, so analogously we may approximate to the roots and forms of the language of the Indo-Europeans from a comparison of the languages spoken by their descendants. For example, if we take the case of the numerals, we see at once that the names for the first ten numbers in any Romance language are not derived from those in any other, but from the Latin. The Sp. ocho, Port. oito, It. otto, Wall. optu, Fr. huit, are all formed independently of each other from the L. octo; and if the L. octo did not exist, we could infer its existence from a comparison of these forms with each other. Similarly the Skr. k'aivâras, Gr. $\tau \in \in \sigma a \rho \varepsilon \varsigma$, Æol. $\pi \in \in \sigma \sigma \rho \varepsilon s$, L. quatuor, Umb. petur, Ir. ceathair (m.), ceteora ( $f$.) , Welsh pedwar ( m .), pédair ( $f$. ), Goth. fidvôr, Lith. keturi, \&c., are all independent of each other, but they all presuppose an Indo-European form kvatvâras, which is nearly the same as the L. quatuor.
§. 19. The sounds that in all probability existed in this language, immediately before the separation of the Asiatic branch from the European, are given in the following table:-


At an older period the I. E. possessed probably no aspirates, and only the single vowel $\alpha, i$ and $u$ being subsequently developed out of this $a$ on the one side, and from the vocalization of $y$ and $v$ on the other.

The representation of an original $a$ by $a, e$, and $o$ distinguishes the European branch of the Indo-European from the Asiatic; thus we have, in the following cases, $a$ in Sanskrit and Zend, and $e$ or $i$ in Greek, Latin, \&c. ; Skr. and Z. das'an, Gr. סśкa, L. decem, O. H. G. zehan ; Skr. sad, Z. had, Gr. Éסos, L. sedeo, Goth. sita; Skr. madhya, Z. maidhya, Gr. $\mu \notin \sigma o s$, L. medius, Goth. midjis. This change of $a$ into $e$ and then into $i$ occurred in very early times, while the change into $o$ and then into $u$ is much later. This change is believed by Curtius* to have arisen at a time when the North-European branches had separated from the Southern ones; for the Greek and Latin frequently agree in representing an original $a$ by $o$, in cases where the Gothic, Lithuanian, \&c., preserve the $a$, or change it to $i$; as in

Gr. $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \omega^{\prime} \kappa \omega$, L. gnosco, O. H. G. knâu.
Gr. ỏís, L. ovis, Goth. avistr.
Gr. òктஸ́, L. octo, Goth. ahtau.
Gr. סó $о$ оя, L. domus, A. S. timber, O. H. G. zimbar.
In this respect the Keltic languages are more akin to the Greek and Latin than to the languages of Northern Europe. When $e$ and $o$ had been developed out of $a$, the greater num-

[^6]ber of the Greek dialects made no further change ; but the Жolic dialect and the Italic languages frequently change this $e$ and $o$ into $i$ and $u$.
§. 20. The Guttural $\ddot{n}$ is an uncommon sound, and only occurs before gutturals. $M$ is an older sound than $n$ : thus, Skr. damam (acc. sing.) and L. domum are older than Gr. סó $\mu$ ov, and L. decem than Skr. das'an. The change of $m$ into $n$ is very common: thus G. boden comes from O.H. G. bodam, Fr. rien from L. rem, It. con from L. cum, Fr. nappe from L. mappa, Wall. furnice from L. formica.

The converse of this change seldom occurs; but, as it is sometimes found in modern languages, as in E. ransom from Fr. rançon, we may from analogy infer that a similar interchange between $m$ and $n$ existed in the Indo-European.
§. 21. From the number of cases in which $l$ in Sanskrit corresponds to $l$ in the European languages, we infer that $l$, as well as $r$, existed, in the Indo-European, although the $r$-sound vastly predominated. Thus we have,

Skr. kalya, Gr. кu入ós, Goth. hails, E. whole.
Skr. sphal, Gr. $\sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, L. fallo, O. H. G. fallan.
Skr. mala, Gr. $\mu$ é $\lambda a s$, L. malus, Goth. mail.
Skr. lis', Gr. ò $\lambda$ íyos, Goth. leihts.
Skr. l̂̂, Gr. $\lambda \dot{v} \omega$, L. reluo, Goth. laus (loose).
Skr. lubl, Gr. $\lambda_{i \pi \tau т о \mu a l, ~ L . ~ l u b e t, ~ G o t h . ~ l i u b s . ~}^{\text {lin }}$
Skr. lôta (loot), Gr. $\lambda$ عía, L. lucrum, Goth. laun.
Skr. lash, Gr. $\lambda a ́ \omega$, L. lascivus, Goth. lustus (lust).
On the other hand, there are many roots in which the European languages present $l$ where the Sanskrit has $r$; thus,

Skr. $\hat{\text { rrmi (a wave), Gr. }}$ è $\lambda \hat{u}^{\prime} \omega$, L. volvo, Goth. valvjan.
Skr. par, Gr. $\pi \lambda$ и́ $\rho \eta$ s, L. plenus, Goth. fulls.
Skr. ruk', Gr. $\lambda$ غuкós, L. luceo, Goth. liuhath.
Skr. rik', Gr. $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi m \omega$, L. linquo, Goth. laiba.
This is one of the facts from which Lottner (K. Z., vol. vii., p. 19), infors that, after the Europeans separated from the
parent stock, they remained for some time united together as one people.
$R$ always has had a tendency to become $l$, as we see from the Romance languages: thus, It. albero comes from L. arbor, It. cêlebro from L. cerebrum, Fr. autel from L. altare, It. pelle-* grino from L. peregrinus. The reverse change also occurs, but much less frequently: we find it in Fr. rossignol from L. lusciniolus, Fr. apôtre from L. apostolus, Fr. chapitre from L. capitulum, Fr. esclandre from $\sigma \kappa a ́ v \delta a \lambda o v$, Wall. poporu from L. populus, Wall. firu from L. filum. In some of these cases dissimilation has favoured this change.

## §. 22. The Indo-European B.

The chief proof that $b$ existed in the Indo-European is the fact that it forms the chief element in the original sound $b h$. That it must have had a very limited sphere, is proved by the few cases in which it seems to be original. These cases are thefollowing:-Gr. $\beta$ рaхús, $\beta$ pó $\chi \chi$ os, Goth. praggan (to press), the fundamental idea being "narrowness;" Skr. lamb (to fall), L. labi, E. slip (Benfey compares E. limp), Goth. slêpan and E. sleep come perhaps from this root, the fundamental idea being that of "sinking down to rest;" Gr. кávvaßıs, O. H. G. hanf, E. hemp; Skr. kubg'a (crooked), Gr. кv́ßos, Goth. hups, O. H. G. huf, L. cubare, E. hip and hump; Gr. $\rho$ ó $\mu$ 乃os, $\rho \dot{\varepsilon} \mu \beta \omega$, Goth. vairpan, G. werfen.* $B$ is original in some imitative words; but, as Grimm's law does not apply to such words, it remains unchanged: thus we have Gr. $\beta \lambda_{\eta} \eta \dot{\eta}$, L. balare, O. H. G. blâzan, E. bleat; Skr. barbara, Gr. ßáp $\beta$ apos, L. balbus, E. babble; Gr. $\beta$ o $\mu \beta v \lambda i ́ s$, L. bullire, E. bubble.

Initial $b$, as Grassmann has pointed out, has generally in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, been developed from other sounds : in Sanskrit from $p, b h, m$, and $v$, as $b a n i g^{\prime}$ (a merchant) from

[^7]pan (to buy), bal from lhal, brî from $m r \hat{u}$, and bat from vat; in Greek and Latin from $g v$, as in Gr. $\beta a \rho v ́ s, \beta a i \nu \omega=L$. venio for gvenio; from $d v$, as in L. bis, bellum, bonus; from $v$, as in Gr. ßoúdouaı (Skr. vr, L. volo), $\beta$ pí̌a; from $m$, as in Gr. ßротós, $\beta \lambda \omega ́ \sigma \kappa \omega, \beta \rho a \delta$ ús = Skr. mrdus (mild and slow)=L. blandus for mlandus (E. mild); bucca (Skr. mukha) ; from bh, as in Gr. $\beta \rho^{\varepsilon} \mu \omega$, L. fremo, $\beta$ aбкаi้ข $\omega$, L. fascino; and from $p$, as in Gr. $\beta$ о́ткш (?), L. bibo, buxus.
§. 23. Wherever we find fricative sounds corresponding etymologically to explosive, we believe that the latter are original, as they require a stronger articulation than the former. We find examples of this in the following changes:- $t$ becomes $s$, in Gr. $\sigma v$, Dor. $\tau \dot{v}, \mathrm{~L} . t u$; $d$ becomes $l,{ }^{*}$ in L. laстита $=$ Gr. ঠáкри; L. levir $=$ Gr. סaíp, Skr. devr (a husband's brother) ; L. calamitas, from an older cadamitas ; $d$ becomes $r$ in L. arvorsum $=$ advorsum, L. meridies for medidies, Sp. lampara from acc. sing. of L. lampas; becomes $v$ in Fr. avoir $=\mathrm{L}$. habere $; k$ becomes a sibilant in Fr. cent from L. centum, Skr. das'an from I. E. dakam, Skr. s'van from I. E. kvan, Fr. cheval from L. caballus. The modern Greek spirants have been developed from the old aspirates, and the Latin spirants $h$ and $f$ from the old $g h$ and $b h$.

There are some exceptions to this law : thus $g v$ has been developed from $v \dagger$ in It. golpe from L. vulpes, Fr. gâter and It. guastare from L. vastare, Fr. guêpe from L. vespa. V has become $p$ on account of the $s^{\prime}$ in Z. $s^{\prime} p \hat{a}=\mathrm{Skr}$. $s^{\prime} v \hat{a}$. In the Lesbian dialect we find $\beta$ for $\mathbf{F}$ before $\rho$; here either $\mathbf{F}$ became $\beta$, or else $\beta$ was pronounced as $\mathbf{F}$. The Romans disliked the group $v u$, and frequently used $b u$, as in ferbui from ferveo; similarly the Greeks said $\beta$ oúdouaı for Fov入ouaı. D represents

[^8]an older $l$ and $r$ in some Norwegian dialects; thus in Sogndal $l l$ becomes $d l$, as in kadla for kalla, gudl for gull, \&c.. In Danish we have $l d$ for $l l$, as in fuld $=\mathrm{E}$. full; and fald $=\mathrm{E}$. fall.
§. 24. That the weak aspirates existed in the Indo-European, is proved by the fact that the Sanskrit weak aspirates are represented in Zend by the mediæ and mediæ aspiratæ; in Slavic, Lettic, Gothic, and Irish, by the mediæ; and in Latin sometimes by the mediæ. Thus, we have Skr. dhâ (to place), Z. dâ, L. do (in condo), Lith. dedì, E. do, doom; Skr. bhar (to bear), Z. bar, L. fero, Goth. baira, Lith. bérnas (a child), E. burden; Skr. bĥ̂ (to be), Z. b̂̂, L. fui, Lith. búti (to be), E. be; Skr. bhrâtar, Z. brâtar, L. frater, Goth. brôthar, Ir. bráthir ; Skr. madhya, Z. maidhya, L. medius, Osk. mefiai (= media), Ir. medón, Goth. midjis ; I. E. dnambhas,* Skr. nabhas, L. nubes, Sl. nebo, Ir. neamh, Lith. debesis. These examples are sufficient to prove the original existence of the mediæ aspiratæ; for, if they had been developed from the mediæ in Sanskrit, after it had become a distinct language, we should find them represented in Gothic, for example, by $k, t$, and $p$, and not by $g, d$, and $b$; and if they had been developed from the tenues aspiratæ, we should not find them re-- presented in the cognate languages by the medir.
§. 25. Whether the Indo-European possessed the hard, as well as the soft, aspirates is still a disputed question. $\dagger$ The main argument brought forward in support of the opinion that it did, is the fact that the Greek aspirates, which are hard, correspond in many cases to the hard aspirates in Sanskrit. Now, in all these cases I believe that the tenuis was the original sound, and that the aspiration is generally due to the influence of neighbouring sounds, which have sometimes fallen

[^9]out. Moreover, in many of these examples we find in Greek side-forms with the simple tenuis, which evidently contain older forms of the roots. Thus, a sibilant has aspirated the tenuis in the following cases:-sphar (caus. to throw), $\sigma \phi a i \varrho a$, also $\sigma \pi a i \varrho \omega$, à $\sigma \pi a i \varrho \omega$; sphur (= sphar), $\sigma \phi \tilde{v} \rho a, \sigma \phi v \rho o ́ v ;$ sphal (caus. with $\hat{d}$, to strike), $\sigma \phi \dot{a} \lambda \lambda \omega$, A. S. feallan, Lith. pùltti (to fall), sphurg' (to thunder), $\sigma \phi \dot{\varrho} \rho \gamma^{\prime} \circ \mathrm{s}$, sphant (to split), $\sigma \phi \dot{\eta} \nu$; phalaka (a bench), $\sigma \phi_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda a s ; k^{\prime} h i d$ (to cut), $\sigma \chi^{\prime} \zeta \omega$, L. scindo. In ко́ $\chi \chi^{\circ}$ ¢ = s'ä̈khas the aspiration is due to the nasal. Khalînas (nom. sing.) is borrowed from $\chi$ a $\lambda_{\iota \nu}$ ós. The aspirate in the ending of the 2 sing. perf. -th $a=-\theta a(o i \pi \theta a=v e t t h a)$ is due to the falling out of $v$ from the pronominal stem tva. Grassmann compares $\mu \dot{a} \chi \eta$ with makha (a warrior), $\dot{a} \theta \dot{\eta} \rho$ with athari (the point of a lance), $\mu$ ó $\theta$ oş with math (to agitate), and asserts that the aspirated tenuis in all these cases is original ; but makha comes from magh, $\dot{a} \theta \dot{n} \rho$ is connected with andhas (plant). We find the asp. tenuis developed from the asp. media in nâth (to ask aid) from nâdh, E. need, O. H. G. nôt ; in atha (then) from adha; in kha (aër, colum), Gr. $\chi$ áos, L. halare; in phal (to bear fruit), L. flos, Goth. blôma; in nakha, ojvv $\chi^{-}$, L. unguis, ungula, Ir. ionga, O.H. G. nagal, Lith. n'agas. It is much more probable that the Sanskrit hard aspirates and the Greek aspirates arose either from the soft aspirates or the tenues, than that both rows of aspirates existed in the IndoEuropean, and afterwards coalesced in Greek.

## CHAPTER III.

## Grimm's Law.*

§. 26. The roots of the Indo-European languages are subject to two distinct classes of changes-irregular or sporadic, and regular. The regular changes permeate all the dialects of a language, while the irregular show themselves chiefly in some one dialect. Thus, in Greek, $\chi, \theta, \phi$, in all the dialects represent the original $g h, d h, b h$; but їккоя, кш̃s, по́ка, ӧка, $\delta \tilde{\alpha}$,
 $\dot{\iota} \beta \varepsilon \lambda$ ós. The regular changes are threefold :-(1), we have the splitting up of an original sound into several others, as when an I. E. $a$ is represented in Greek and Latin by $a, \dot{e}, o$; (2), we have the loss of an original sound running through an entire language, as in the case of the disappearance of the aspirates in Latin; (3), we have the remarkable law of the dislocation of the consonants, discovered by Grimm, and called by him Lautverschiebung, which we now proceed to enunciate and illustrate.
§. 27. This law, stated generally, is as follows :-If the same root exist in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Gothic, and Old High German, when Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin present the aspirate, Gothic presents the corresponding media, and Old High German the corresponding tenuis; when the first three languages present the media, Gothic has the tenuis, and Old High German the aspirate ; when the first three languages

[^10]present the tenuis, Gothic has the aspirate, and Old High German the media. This law may be tabularly exhibited thus:-

| Skr. Gr. L. | GH | DH | BH | G | D | B | K | T | P |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Goth. | G | D | B | K | T | P | GH | DH | BH |
| O. f. G. | K | T | P | GH | DH | BH | G | D | B |

These letters, of course, are only symbols; for in Latin we have no real aspirates, but merely the corresponding breathings, and moreover the dental breathing is wanting in Latin; in Greek we have only the hard aspirates; in Sanskrit H fiequently takes the place of an older $\mathrm{GH}, \mathrm{DH}$, or BH ; in Gothic the guttural and labial aspirates are replaced by H and F ; and in Old High German for the expected guttural and labial medir we find H and F . Extending this law to Keltic, Slavic, and Lettic, we may add that these languages, though for the most part they stand on the same line as the Sanskrit, represent the soft aspirates always by the corresponding medir. Translating these symbols, then, into the actual consonants that represent them in each language, we have the following tables:-
I.

|  | $(1)$. | $(2)$. | (3). |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. E. | $g h$, | $d h$ | $b h$ |
| Skr. | $g h, h$ | $d h, h$ | $b h, h$ |
| Z. | $g, g h, g^{\prime}, z, z h$, | $d, d h$ | $b$ |
| Gr. | $\chi$ | $\theta$ | $\phi$ |
| L. | $h, f, g$, | $f, d, b$, | $f, b$ |
| Kel | $g$ | $d$ | $b$ |
| Sl. | $g, z, z$ | $d$ | $b$ |
| Lith. | $g, z$, | $d$ | $b$ |
| Goth. | $g$ | $d$ | $b$ |
| O. H. G. | $k$ | $t$ | $p$ |

II.

| I. E. | $g$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Skr. | $g, g^{\prime}$ |
| Z. | $g, g h, g^{\prime}, z, z h$ |
| Gr. | $\gamma$ |
| L. | $g$ |
| Kel. | $g$ |
| Sl. | $g, \stackrel{y}{z}, z$, |
| Lith. | $g, z$ |
| Goth. | $k$ |
| O. H. G. | $c h$ |


| $(2)$ | $(3)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $d$ | $b$ |
| $d$ | $b$ |


| $d, d h$ | $b$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\delta$ | $\beta$ |
| $d$ | $b$ |
| $d$ | $b$ |
| $d$ | $b$ |
| $d$ | $b$ |
| $t$ | $p$ |
| $z, s z$ | $f, p f$ |

## III.

|  | (1). | (2). | (3). |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. E. | $k$ | $t$ | $p$ |
| Skr. | $k, k h, k^{\prime}, s^{\prime}$ | $t, t h$ | $p, p h$ |
| Z. | $k, k h, k^{\prime}, s^{\prime}$ | $t, t h$ | $p, f$ |
| Gr. | $\kappa$ | $\tau$ | $\pi$ |
| L. | $c, q$, | $t$ | $p$ |
| Kel. | $c, c h$, | $t, t h$ | $-p$ |
| Sl. | $k, c, c, s$ | $t$ | $p$ |
| Lith. | $k, s z$, | $t$ | $p$ |
| Goth. | $h, g$ | $t h, d$ | $f, b$ |
| O. H. G. | $h, g$ | $d$ | $f, v, b$. |

§. 28. Examples of Grimm's Law.*
I. (1). Skr. dîrgha (long), Z. darĕgha (long), Gr. סo入८ $\chi$ ós,
L. longus, Goth. laggs. Skr. laghu (light), Gr. ह̇入axús, L. levis for legvis, O. H. G. lîht, Kel. lugu in Lugudunum, another form of Lugdunum. Skr. gharsh (to rub), Gr. $\chi$ рí $\omega$, L. frio, frico. Skr. ghas (to eat), L. hostis, O. L. fostis, hospes (qui ci-

[^11]bum petit), Goth. gasts, E. guest, Lith. gaspadà (hospitium), and, according to Bopp, Gr. yaбтíp. Skr. haryâmi (I love), Gr. $\chi$ ai $\rho \omega$, L. gratus, Goth. faihu-gairns (greedy of money), E. yearn, O. H. G. kiri (desire). Skr. hyas (yesterday), Gr. $\chi^{\theta}$ És, L. heri, hesternus, Goth. gistra, E. yesterday, O. H. G. këstar. Skr. hainsa (a goose), Gr. $\chi \dot{\eta} \nu$, L. anser, Goth. gans, E. goose, O. H. G. kans. Skr. vah (to carry), Gr. oै $\chi o s$, L. veho, Goth. vigs (via). O. H. G. waggan (currus), Gr. $\chi$ ópтоя, L. hortus, cohors, E. garden, gird, O. H. G. karto, Goth. gards (a house).
I. (2). Skr. indh (to burn), Gr. ai $\theta \omega$, L. astus, ades, A. S. âd, O. H. G. eit (fire). Skr. rudhira (blood), Gr. ̧̧̣u0 0 ós, L. ruber, mufus, E. red, O. H. G. rôt. Skr. dhê (to drink), Gr. $\theta \bar{\eta} \sigma \theta a \iota, \theta_{\eta} \lambda$ и́, L. filius, femina, Goth. daddja (lacto), O. H. G. tâu (lacto). Skr. dharsh (to dare), Z. daresh (to dare), Gr. $\theta$ á $\rho \sigma o s$, L. fortis, Goth. gadaursan (to dare), O.H. G. gitar. Skr. dĥ̂ (to shake, blow), Z. dunman (vapour), Gr. $\theta \dot{v} \omega, \theta \dot{v} \varepsilon \lambda \lambda a, \theta v \mu o ́ s$, L. fumus, suffio, Goth. dauns (odor), E. dust, O. H. G. tunst (storm).
I. (3). Skr. bĥ̂ (to be), Z. b̂̂ (to be), Gr. фv́ $\omega$, L. fui, E. be, O. H. G. pim (I am). Skr. bhrâtar, Z. brâtar, Gr. фৎatpía, L. frater, Goth. brôthar, O. H. G. pruodar. Z. bar (to bore), Gr. фá $\rho o s, \phi a ́ \rho a \gamma \xi, ~ L . ~ f o r a r e, ~ E . ~ b o r e, ~ O . ~ H . ~ G . ~ p o-~$ ran. Skr. bhadra (best), E. better, best. Skr. bhan̆n' (to break), Gr. $\rho \dot{\eta} \gamma v v \mu$, L. frango, Goth. brikan, O. H. G. prëchan.
II. (1). Skr. g'an (to beget), Z. zan (to beget), Gr. $\gamma^{\text {́vos }}$, L. genus, Goth. kuni (race), E. kind, child, O. H. G. chind (offspring). Skr. gar (to sound), Z. gar (to sing), Gr. $\gamma \tilde{\eta} \rho \rho_{\mathrm{c}}$, L. garrio, gallus, E. call. Skr. guru (heavy), Goth. kaurs (heavy), E. care. Skr. bhug' (to enjoy, endure), L. fruor, fungor, Goth. brûkjan, E. brook. Skr. ganda and hanu (gena), Gr. $\gamma^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v}^{\prime}$, L. gena, Goth. kinnus (chin), O. H. G. chinni.
II. (2). Skr. druma (wood), Z. dru (wood), Gr. $\delta \rho \tilde{v}_{\varsigma}, \delta o ́ \rho v$, $\delta \varepsilon ́ v \delta \rho o \nu, G o t h$. triu (tree). Skr. dam (to tame), Gr. $\delta a \mu a ́ \omega$, L. domare, dominus, Goth. gatamjan (to tame), O. H. G. $z a m i^{\circ}$
(tame). Skr. dis' (to show), Gr. סeíкขupl, L. dico, Goth. teiha (nuntio), O. H. G. zeigôm. Skr. and Z. das'an, Gr. ס£́кa, L. decem, Goth. taihun, O. H. G. zehan. Skr. and Z. dva, Gr. $\delta v ́ w, ~ L . ~ d u o, ~ G o t h . ~ t v a i, ~ G . ~ z w e i . ~ S k r . ~ v i d ~(t o ~ p e r c e i v e), ~$ oif $\delta a=$ Goth. vait = Skr. vêda, L. video, O.H. G. wizan. Skr. dant (tooth), Z. dan̆t, Gr. ódoús, L. dens, Goth. tunthus, O. H. G. zand. Gr. $\rho i \not \iota_{a}$ for Fpıঠıa, Lesb. $\beta \rho i \sigma \delta a$, L. radix, Goth. vaurts (root), O. H. G. wurza.

## II. (3). Consult § 22.

III. (1). Skr. s'vas'ura (socer), Z. qas'ura, Gr. غ́кvoós, Gr. socer, Goth. svaihra, G. schwager. Skr. dars' (to see), Gr. סє́pкш, O. S. torht (bright), E. torch, O. H. G. zoraht. Skr. $a_{s}{ }^{\prime} u$ (a tear), Gr. ס́áкøv, O. L. dacruma, Goth. tagr, O. H. G. zahar. Skr. s'âláa (house), Gr. кa入ía, L. cella, domi-cilium, celare, E. hall, hell, hole. Skr. kalya (healthy), Gr. кa入ós, Goth. hails, E. whole, heal, G. heil. Skr. s'î (to lie), Gr. кєïцaı, L. quies, civis $=$ Osk. kevs, Goth. haims (village), E. home, hamlet. Gr. к $\lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \pi \tau \omega$, L. clepo, Goth. hliftus $=\kappa \lambda \varepsilon \pi \pi \tau \eta \varsigma$. Skr. s'ru (to hear), Gr. $\kappa \lambda$ v́ $\omega, \kappa \lambda \hat{\varepsilon}_{0}=$ S Skr. s'ravas, L. cluo, cliens, Goth. hliuma (ảко́), O. H. G. llût (loud), Sl. slava (glory). Skr. karsh (to draw), L. accerso, E. hearse, harrow. Skr. kâs (to cough), E. husky, O. H. G. huosto.
III. (2). Skr. tri, Z. thri, Gr. тןєis, L. tres, Goth. threis, O. H. G. $d r \hat{\imath} . ~ S k r . ~ t a r s h ~(t o ~ t h i r s t), ~ Z . ~ t a r s h n a ~(t h i r s t), ~ G r . ~$ $\tau$ ₹ $\rho \sigma o \mu a \iota$, L. torreo, terra (?), Goth. thaurstei (thirst), G. durst. Skr. tar (to cross), Z. tarô (across), Gr. т£́p $a$, L. terminus, trans $=$ Umb. traf, O. N. thröm (margo), E. through, O. H. G. drum (finis). Skr. pat* (to fly), patra (a wing), Gr. $\pi$ є́тоцаı, $\pi \tau \varepsilon \rho^{\prime} \nu$, L. peto, penna (O. L. pesna), acci-piter, prapes, O.H.G. fedara (a wing), E. feather. Skr. and Z. tan (to stretch), Gr. $\tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$, L. tendo, tenuis, Goth. thanja (extendo), O. H. G. dunni

[^12](thin). Skr. tu (to be powerful, to increase), Z. $t u$ (to be able), Gr. túdoş, тaû̀s $\mu$ и́ $\gamma$ as (Hesych.), L. tumeo, tuber, tueor, totus, Umb. tauta (a city), O. Pr. tauta (land), Ir. tuath (people), Goth. thiuda (people), E. thumb, O. H. G. dûmo (thumb).
III. (3). Skr. apa (away), Z. apa, Gr. àmò, L. ab, Goth. af, O. H. G. aba. Skr. saptan, Z. haptan, Gr. èmrá, L. septem, Goth. sibun. Skr. parâ (away), Z. para (from), Gr. тapá, L. per, Goth. fra-, E. from, O. H. G. far-, N.H.G. ver. Skr. and Z. par (to bring over), Gr. $\pi \varepsilon \rho a ́ \omega$, L. porta, Goth. faran (to go), E. fare, G. erfalren. Skr. and Z. par (to fill), Gr. $\pi i \mu \pi \lambda \eta \mu$, L. plenus, populus, E. folk, full. Skr. prî (to please), Z. frî (to love), Gr. $\pi \rho a u ̛ ́ s, ~ E . ~ f r i e n d . ~ G r . ~ \pi u ́ \xi, ~ L . ~ p u g n u s, ~$ E.fst. Gr. $\pi \lambda$ ì $\theta$ os, E. fint (?). Gr. $\pi a \tilde{u} \rho o s$, L. paucus, E. few. Skr. prath (to extend), Gr. $\pi \lambda$ arís, L. Latium, E. flat.
§. 29. No satisfactory explanation of the origin of the changes expressed by this law has ever been given. It has been suggested* that "this phonetic diversity is due to a previous state of language in which the two or three principal points of consonantal contact were not yet felt as definitely separated from each other." Each of the branches of the IndoEuropean family, it is maintained, modified this sound in its own way ; hence we have different forms of the original vague sound. But, it is extremely unlikely $\dagger$ that such vague sounds existed in the original Indo-European language contemporaneously with the strong articulation which is peculiar to all old languages. If we thus account for the origin of Skr. ap and L. aqua, Æol. mírugॄg, and L. quatuor, \&e., we will be forced from analogy to account for the origin of the Wallachian apa, epa, patruł from aqua, equa, quatuor, in

[^13]the same way, and to assert that these Latin words were pronounced with a vague and indistinct consonantal sound ; this, however, is too absurd to be maintained for a moment.

The very example (Skr. gharma, Gr. $\theta_{£} \rho \mu$ ós, L. formus) given by Max Müller should have been sufficient to demonstrate the incorrectness of this theory; for what pronounceable sound can be imagined which could approximate to each of these guttural ( $g h$ ), dental ( $\theta$ ), and labial $(f)$ sounds, without being exactly any of them? Such divergencies arose, not from any vague articulation on the part of the Indo-Europeans, but from other causes. These were (1), the influence of neighbouring sounds; (2), the springing up of adventitious or parasitic sounds; (3), a psychological principle of differentiation, i. e., a desire to keep up within the limits of the same language a difference between words or sounds that threaten to become identical, or to develope such a difference between words or sounds that are at a given moment identical. We find examples of (1) in the derivation of the Wall. epa, apa from equa, aqua; for the $u(v)$ became $p$ through the influence of the tenuis $q(k)$. We find (2) exemplified in such forms as $\chi \theta^{0}$ s, Skr. hyas, I. E. ghyas, where the $y$ developed $d$ before itself, as it frequently does, and then fell out, this $\delta$ afterwards becoming $\theta$ on account of the preceding $\chi$.

We find numerous examples of psychological processes in all languages. Thus in Greek we have á $\mu \varepsilon i \nu \omega \nu, \mu \varepsilon i \zeta \omega \nu, \tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$, for $\dot{a} \mu \varepsilon \nu \mathrm{y} \omega \nu, \lambda_{\varepsilon \gamma \mathrm{y} \omega \nu}, \tau \varepsilon \nu \mathrm{y} \omega$, where the $\iota$ arises from the throwing back of the original $y$ that once existed in the last syllable, and where this $y$ must have been present to the mind before it was pronounced. This effect-called variously Hy perthesis, Infection, or Umlaut-appears in its complete form in Zend. We find it also in English, as in the verb to fell, the
seem to be borne out by the forms of the Wallachian language. The example (Osc. pomtis $=$ L. quinque) adduced by himself overthrows this theory ; for the Wallachian for five is quinqué, a word evidently of pure Latin origin.
causative of to fall, where the $e$ (ai) arises from $a$ by hyperthesis. In Latin forms such as scripsi we also see the effect of Psychological influence, for as in the hyperthesis of $i$ we think of the following $y$, so we think of the following $s$, and change the $b$ of scribo into $p$, as $s$ is a hard sound. We see a similar cause at work in the origin of the It. buono, nuovo, fuora, fuoco, from L. bonus, novus, foris, focus. The Italians had lost the distinction between the short and the long $o$, but they still felt that a distinction should be made between the $o$ of nơvus and the $o$ of nonus; so, while they kept $o$ wherever it was long, they employed $u 0$ to represent $o$ when it was short.

In the old Norse imperfect indicative we find the $a$ of the singular changed into $\ddot{o}$ in the plural, on account of the $u$ of the final syllable, which therefore must have been present to the mind during the pronunciation of the first syllable; thus, sing. 1. kalladha, 2. kalladhir, 3. kalladhi; pl. 1. kölludhum, 2. kölludhut, 3. kölludhu.*
§. 30. The changes of sounds, noticed in the last section, arise from what has been called by Max Müller Dialectic Growth ; but there are other changes that manifest themselves not only in some ancient languages, but also much more frequently in their modern representatives. These latter arise from what he calls Phonetic Decay $\dagger \dagger$ and the cause of this decay he rightly traces to laziness, or want of muscular energy on the part of the speaker. Thus, as he remarks, nearly all the changes that have taken place in the transition from Anglo-Saxon to modern English belong to this class. We have silly from salig, woman from wîfman, lord from hlâford, king from cyning, \&c. Similarly we have squire from Fr. escuier,

[^14]L. scutarius; stranger from Fr. estrangier, L. extraneus; sexton fromFr.sacristain ; chapter from Fr.chapitre, L. capitulum; damsel from Fr. demoiselle, L. dominicella; Sir from Fr. sieur, L. senior. In Greek the insertion of the mediæ between $\mu$ and $\rho$, or $\nu$ and $\rho$, is due to the same cause, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \nu \delta \rho \varepsilon s$ and $\gamma a \mu \beta \rho o{ }_{\rho}$ being more easily pronounced than ávess and $\gamma$ a $\mu \rho o s$. We find similar insertions in English, as to slumber from A. S. slumerian, cinders from L. cineres, \&c. In Goth. hunds, E. hound (L. canis), $d$ has been added to facilitate the pronunciation. The $d \mathrm{~s}$ in gold and mind have been explained in the same way, but wrongly, so, for gold is the Gothic gulth = I. E. ghar-ta from I. E. and Skr. ghar (to shine), whence Skr. hirana, hiranya (gold), Z. zaranu, zaranya (gold), Gr. $\chi \rho v \sigma o ́ s=\chi \varrho v \tau y o s=$ I. E. ghartyas, $\chi$ 入ovvós $=\chi \rho v \sigma o ́ s(H e s y c h),$. Phryg. $\gamma \lambda$ lovoós $\chi \rho v \sigma o ́ s$ (Hesych.) ; and mind = L. ment in mentis. From this root ghar come also Skr. hrîku, hlîku (tin), Gr. $\chi$ a ${ }^{\lambda}$ кós, and L. glisco.

## §. 31. Apparent Exceptions to Grimm's Law.*

The first class of these exceptions consists of natural sounds (naturlaute), onomatopœic, and imitative words; thus we have as natural sounds, Skr. attâ (mother), Gr. ä $\quad$ ( L. atta, Goth. atta (father) ; $m a$ and $p a$, the words used by infants for their food and their parents, whence arise Gr. $\mu a ́ \mu \mu \eta, \stackrel{a}{a} \pi \pi a$, L. mamma, mamilla, papilla, G. amme, E. mamma, papa, paps, pap; Skr. tâta (dear, used chiefly by parents addressing their children, and children their parents), Gr. $\tau \varepsilon \not \tau \tau a, \tau a ́ \tau a, ~ \tau i ́ \tau \theta \eta, \tau \iota \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$, L. tata, E. tit, teat, O. H. G. tutto (breast), toto (godfather), Lith. teta (aunt): as onomatopœic and imitative words, we have Skr. hrêsh (to neigh), O. H. G. hross, E. horse ; Skr. hikkâ, E. hiccough; Gr. vidakrē, E. howl, G. heulen; Gr. кגaүүй, L. clango, E. clank, clatter, clap,

[^15]O. N. klaka ; L. grunnio, E. grunt ; Gr. $\mu \nu \kappa \ddot{\sigma} \sigma \theta a t, \mu \eta \kappa \bar{\sigma} \sigma \theta a t$, G. meckern; Gr. 入ántш, L. lambo, labrum, E. lap, lip.

A second class consists of borrowed words. L. tus is borrowed from Gr. $\theta$ vós ; if it were genuine Latin, it would begin with $f$, as the root is Skr. dhû. L. scalpo and sculpo, along with the art of sculpture, were borrowed from the Greeks; for these words correspond to Gr. $\gamma \lambda$ 'í $\phi \omega$ and $\gamma \lambda{ }^{\prime} \dot{\phi} \phi \omega$, the $p$ representing the hard $\dot{p}$; the words gluber and glubo are genuine Latin words, $b$ being the exact equivalent of the Gr. $\phi$. Scribo also exactly corresponds to $\gamma \rho$ á $\phi \omega$, with the exception of the prefixed $s$, which proves either that writing was known to the Cireeks and Italians while they still formed one people, or that scribo was borrowed from the Greeks in very early times, when $\phi$ was still soft. When a word belonging to any one of the three classes of languages, whose consonants are regulated according to Grimm's law, is similar in meaning and consonants to a word belonging to either of the other classes, we may lay down, as a general rule, either that one of these words was horrowed from the other, or else that there is no connexion between them. E. husky has nothing to do with Z. luskia (dry); for husky is connected with Skr. kâs (to cough), and luska = Skr. s'ushka (dry, emaciated), Gr. $\sigma a v{ }^{\prime}$ ós (dry), L. siccus. E. go is not from same root as Skr. gâ, but we find it in Skr. hâ ( to go), I. E. ghâ. E. look is not the Skr. lok (to see), hut rather laksh (to see) $=l a g+s$. E. whole is not the same as Gr. ö̀os; for E. $h$ represents an I. E. $k$, while the Greek aspirate represents an I. E. s. E. call is not connected with Gr. калєïv, nor E. care with L. cura; for E. $\boldsymbol{c}$ requires $g$ in the corresponding Greek and Latin roots; E. call corresponds to Skr. gar (to praise), gir (a voice), Gr. $\gamma \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho v$, L. garrio, gallus, and E. care to Skr. guru (heavy), L. gravis.

A third class of exceptions arises from sounds having been irregularly changed within the same language : thus $h$ in E. heart appears to represent $h$ in Skr. $h r d$, but here the Skr. $h$ has been developed from an I. E. $k$, as we see from the cog-
nate forms, Gr. kapס̌́a, L. cor, Ir. cride. The following cases are easily explained by supposing that the corresponding Indo-European roots began and ended with aspirates. Thus we have, I. E. bhudhna, Skr. budhna (depth), Gr. $\pi v \theta \mu \eta \boldsymbol{\nu}$, L. fundus, O. H. G. bodam, E. bottom ; I. E. bhudh, Skr. budh (to know), Gr. $\pi v \nu$ 日́vooual, Goth. biuda (I know); I.E. bhandh, Skr. bandh (to bind), Gr. $\pi \varepsilon v \theta$ єрós, $\pi \varepsilon i \sigma \mu a l$, L. fascis, funis, E. bind; I. E. bhidh, Gr. $\pi \varepsilon i \theta \omega$, L. fido, Goth. bidja; I. E. bhâdh, Skr. bâdh (to repel), Gr. $\pi a ́ \sigma \chi \omega$ (for $\pi a \theta-\sigma \kappa \omega$ ), L. fendo, O. N. böd (a fight), A. S. beadu; I. E. bhâghu, Skr. bâhuc
 Skr. bahu (large), Gr. $\pi a \chi$ ús ; I. E. bhugh, Skr. banih (to grow), Goth. bagms (tree), E. beam ; I. E. bhugh, Skr. bhug' (to bend), Gr. $\phi \varepsilon र ́ \gamma \omega$, L. fugio, Goth. biuga (I bend) ; I. E. bhargh, Gr. фф́á $\sigma \omega$ (for фоaүy $)$ ), Goth. bairga (I guard), baurgs (a town) ; I. E. bhargh, L. Aagellum, Goth. bliggvan (to scourge); I. E. dhûbh, Skr. dhûp (to fumigate), Gr. тüфos (smoke), זup入ós, Goth. daubs (deaf), dumbs (dumb), G. taub ; I. E. dhigh, Skr. dih (to smear), Gr. $\theta_{\imath} \gamma \gamma$ áv $\omega$, L. fingo, Goth. deiga (I form), daigs (dough), G. teig; I. E. dhagh, Skr. dak (to burn), Goth. dags (day), O. H. G. tâht, (a lampwick), G. tag, docht ; I. E. dhughatar, Skr. duhitar, Goth. dauhtar, O. H. G. tohtar : this word comes perhaps from the next root, and means the "milker;" I. E. dhugh, Skr. duh (to milk, to enjoy), Goth. dugan (to be useful), E. dug, Ir. diugaim (I drink off), Scot. deoghail (mammas sugere); I. E. $d h r u g h$, Skr. druk (to hurt), Gr. $\theta^{e} \hat{\lambda} \gamma \omega$ (?) L. frustra, Goth. driugan, O. N. draugr (a ghost), Z. dmug' (an evil spirit), O. H. G. triugan (to deceive), Ir. droch (bad) ; I. E. ghabh, Skr. g'abh, (to gape), E. gape; I. E. ghardh, Skr. gardh (to desire), Goth. grêdags (hungry), E. greedy, O. H. G. kir (desire), G. gier, Ir. gradh (love). D in Skr. dvâra (a door), represents an I. E. dh; for we have Gr. Oúpa, L. fores, Goth. daur, O.H. G. tor., Ir. dor (a door). Gr. $\gamma \varepsilon$ (Skr. ha, Ved. gha), may have arisen on European soil from an older $\chi^{\varepsilon}$,
from same root as $\chi \iota$ in $\eta^{\chi} \chi$, Skr. hi. Bopp, however, connects with $\gamma^{\varepsilon}$ the $k$ in Goth. mik, thuk, and the $h$ in O. H. G. unsih, iwih, which can only be explained on the supposition of an original g. In Skr. aham, Gr. ह̇ $\gamma \dot{\omega}$, L. ego, Goth. ik, Skr. mahat, Gr. $\mu \varepsilon \gamma$ as, L. magnus, Goth. mikils $=\mu \varepsilon \gamma$ ádos, Skr. hanu (jaw), Gr. yévus, L. gena, Goth. kinnus, Skr. lañgh (to jump), Gr. $\lambda a \gamma \omega$ s, Goth. laikan, the Gothic and Greek forms point back to an I. E. $g$, while the Skr. $h$ represents an I. E. gh. Hence we may infer either that the Indo-European possessed these roots in a double form before the separation of the Sanskrit from the other languages, or that the Sanskrit subsequently aspirated the original $g$, and then reduced it to $h$.

## §. 32. Actual Exceptions to Grimm's Law.

These exceptions occur in the consonantal groups $s k$, st, $s p$. Thus we have Skr. l'had (to conceal), from I. E. skad, Gr. бкóros, Goth. skadus (shadow), Ir. scath (shade); L. piscis, Goth. fisks ; Skr. k'hid (to cut), from I. E. skid, Gr. $\sigma \chi^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\iota} \omega \omega$, L. scindo, Goth. skaida (separo), Ir. scaithim (I cut off); L. hostis, Goth. gasts; Skr. târa (star), Gr. ả átŋ̣, L. stella, Goth. stairnô; Skr. tud (to strike), from I. E. stud (?), Gr. Tu$\delta_{\varepsilon u ́ s}^{s}$ (the striker-compare Charles Martel and Judas Maccabeus), L. tundo, tudes (hammer); Goth. stauta (I strike); Gr. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \bar{\chi} \boldsymbol{\chi}$, Goth. steiga (I ascend); Gr. $\pi \tau v ́ \omega$, L. spuo, pituita, Goth. speiva (spuo).

An original tenuis sometimes appears as a media. Thus we have Gr. סákpv, Goth. tagr ; L. septem, Goth. sibun ; L. quatuor, Goth. fidvôr; Gr. kpaí́s, Goth. hardus; L. centum, Goth. lund ; L. pater, Goth. fadar; L. mater, A. S. môdor (Goth. brôthar and E. father, \&c. are regular) ; Gr. kúros, A. S. hŷd (hide).

In the present participle we have Goth. -and for Skr. -ant, Gr. - ovt, as Goth. bairands (nom. sing. masc.) = Gr. $\phi \hat{\varphi} \rho \omega \nu$, E. friend, fiend. In the past participle we have Goth. $-d$ for

Skr. -ta. This Goth. $d$ must have arisen from an older th, of which traces are still found, as in $f u d s$ and faths $=$ Skr. patis, kunths (known) $=$ Skr. $g^{\prime \prime n}$ âtas $=$ Gr. $\gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ s$ (whence E. uncouth), bairith and buivid = Skr. blarati.

We find the medir unchanged in the following cases:Skr. gar (sonare), E. niyhtin-gale; Skr. g'arbh (aperire); Gr. үŋáф $\omega$, Goth. graba (fodio), E. grave, grub, Ir. grabhaim (I carve), grafuim (I write), grafan (a grubbingr axe); Skr. gras (vorare), L. gramen, E. gruss (unless grass be from I. E. and Skr. ghar (to shine) whence hurit (green) Gr. $\chi \lambda$ 人ó $, ~ L . ~ h o l u s, ~$ E. green) ; Skr. hlâd (to lue glad), Gr. $\kappa$ é $\chi \lambda a \delta a$, E. glad. In many of the cases where a media is retained, this effect is due to the influence of a neighlouring $l, m, n$, or $r$.

The original tenuis is also unchanged in the following cases: Gr. $\tau \varepsilon \tau a \gamma \omega ́ v$, L. tungo, Goth. têkan (to touch), E. take; Skr. pathas = Gr. пáтоя, A. S. püd, E. path.

In the three following cases a Gothic tenuis corresponds to an I. E. aspirate: I. E. magh, Skr. mah (to be great), mâmahyê (macto), makha (a warrior), Gr. $\mu a ́ \chi o \mu a \iota, ~ L . ~ m a c t o, ~ m a c e l l u m, ~$ Goth. meki (a sword); I. E. ghrabh, Skr. grah, Ved. grabh (to seize), Gr. $\begin{aligned} & \text { ¢íios, } \\ & \text {, Goth. greipan (to seize), E. grip, grab, }\end{aligned}$ Ir. grabaim (I devour) : Gr. бкáфо̧, бка́лтн for $\sigma \kappa а \phi \tau \omega$, Goth. skip (ship).

## CHAPTER IV.

The Sanskrit Alphabet.*

## §. 33. Tabular View of the Sounds.



Sanskrit writing is called by the native grammarians $D \hat{e}$ vanâgarî, which means the nâgarî of the gods or brahmans. Nâgarı̂ is the name applied to the current style of writing used by the Hindus, and is supposed to be derived from $n a-$ gara (a city), thus meaning " the art of writing as practised in cities" (M. Müller's "Skr. Gr." p. 1). The names of the letters are formed by adding liâra (making) to each sound; thus $a$ is called akâra, $k$, kakâra, as each consonant is supposed to have a short $a$ inherent in it. $\quad R$ forms an exception, and


* Sanshrta means properly "what is made fit;" hence it came to mean purified, as being made fit for sacred purposes. This is why this name is applied to the ancient sacred language of the Vedas. The local dialects of India are called Prâkrta, i. e. "what has a type, or original" (Benfey's "Skr. Lex."), this type (prâkṛti) being Sanskrit. Sanskria is from sam (oiv) and skar (to cut), according to Lottner, who thirks that in this compound skar is mixed up with kar (to make).


## §. 34. Anusvâra, Anunâsika and Visarga.

Y Anusvâra, $\dot{\dot{n}}$ (from anu, after, and svâra, sound), is a nasal after-sound, and is compared by Bopp to the Fr. $n$ at the end of a syllable. It is, however, properly speaking, not an aftersound, but merely a modification of the preceding vowel (§. 10). Its pronunciation is very weak, for it does not prevent the euphonic influence of an $i$ or $u$ upon a following $s$; in prosody, however, it and Visarga make a preceding short (vowel long, when the next syllable begins with a consonant. It occurs in the middle of words before the sibilants and $h$, as dans' (to bite), hanisa (goose), sinha (lion). Before $y, r$, and $v$, in the middle of words it is only found in reduplicated syllables, as yaniyamyatê. Another anusvâra is used for the nasals, merely "for the sake of neatness in writing," as Colebrook says. This must always receive the same pronunciation as the nasal in the place of which it stands. In Prâkrit a final $m$ always, and, as is never the case in Sanskrit, the dental $n$ become the anusvâra (Bopp's "Skr. Gr.," p. 17).

Anunâsika (from anu, after, and nâsikâ, the nose), is a still weaker nasal sound than Anusvâra; its weakness is shown from the fact that it can be followed by $l$ and $r$. It is very nearly equivalent to the Fr. $n$ in genre. Such a combination is generally avoided in French by inserting $d$, as in viendrai: compare ảvঠ@ós for àvoos.

Visarga, $h$, is an euphonic change of final $s$ and $r$. It may also take the place of $s$ before the loc. pl. ending su. The Visarga that occurs before $k$ and $k k$ is formed by the root of the tongue and is called $G^{\prime} i h v a \hat{a} \hat{u} l \hat{\imath} y a$; that occurring before $p, p h$, and a pause, by the palate, and is called Upadhmânîya; $s$ therefore before labials, is equivalent to the blowing sound $f$ : We see the same change in other languages: thus the Irish $s$ sometimes corresponds to the Welsh $f$; we have in Greek
 may explain on this ground the change of final as into $\hat{o}$ in Sanskrit, through the steps $a s, a f, a v, a u, 0$.

## §. 35. The Vowels.

Sanskrit had no short $e$ or $o$, though the short $a$ had both a clear and an obscure sound (Pân. VIII.4, 68). Short e and $o$ are similarly wanting in Gothic. Skr. $\check{a}$ is represented in Greek by $\breve{a}, \varepsilon, o$; and Skr. $\hat{a}$ by $\tilde{a}, \eta$, $\omega$; in some cases Skr. $\hat{a}$ corresponds to Gr. $\breve{a}, \varepsilon, o$, as in $\hat{a} g a s=a ̈ \gamma o s, ~ v a ̂ s t u=F a ́ \sigma \tau v$, the participial suffix - mânas $=-\mu \varepsilon \nu$ os ( L . - minus ) and $-\mu \nu$ os (L. -mnus) in $\mu \hat{\delta} \delta \dot{\delta} \mu \nu \mathrm{o}, \mu^{\hat{\rho} \rho} \rho \mu \nu a$ (L. alumnus, columna), dhâman $=\theta$ t́́ $\mu a$, dâru $=\delta o ́ \rho v, ~ g ' a ̂ n u=\gamma o ́ v v(L . ~ g \check{n n u), ~ g ' a g ' a ̂ n a ~}$
 vahâmas, \&c. In Bengali $\check{a}$ has either become $o$, or been lost, as in B. opotyo $=$ Skr. apatya; B. ontor $=$ Skr. antara. $\boldsymbol{R}$ is pronounced as $r i$ in merrily. It is never original, but has always been developed from $r$, preceded or followed by any vowel; thus we have trtíya (tertius) from tri, strnômi $=\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu v \mu l, s^{\prime} r i n o ̂ m i(1$ hear) from s'ru, bhrlouti (a frown) from bhrû (an eyebrow), pr $\mathrm{h}^{\prime} h$ from prak'h (to ask), pitr from pitar, dâtr from dâtâr, pitar and dâtâr being the original forms, as the accusatives pitaram $=\pi a \tau \hat{\imath} \rho a$, and dâtâram $=\delta o r \tilde{p} \rho a$ prove. The vowel $\hat{r}$ is pronounced exactly as $r \hat{\imath}$; it only occurs in nouns whose stems end in $r$, and which lengthen this vowel after the analogy of other nouns, whose stems end in other
 trnâm $=$ datorum. The vowel $l$ is pronounced as $l i$. It has been developed from an older $?$, and occurs only in the root $k l p$ (to create), which is derived from $k r$ and the causal $p$, which is connected, perhaps, with the root of mot' $\omega$. Bopp connects E. help, and Benfey L. corpus, with this root. The long ? vowel never occurs, and is merely an invention of the grammarians.

## §. 36. Weight of the Vowels.

$A$ is heavier than $u$, and $u$ heavier than $i$; that is, $a$ occurs in the lightest forms, $i$ in the heaviest, and $u$ in the interme-
diate. For instance, the terminations -vas, -thas, -tas are heavier than $-m i,-s i,-t i$; hence we have yunâmi (I bind), yunâsi, yunâti, but yunîvas (we two bind), yunîthas, yunîtas; similarly we have $a$ weakened to $u$ in kurmas (we make), beside karômi (I make), and in -thus, -tus, the terminations of the 2 nd and 3 rd dual of the reduplicated perfect, beside -thas and -tas of the present. As $e$ is equal to ai, it is lighter than $a$, and heavier than $i$; hence we have $\hat{e} m i=\varepsilon i \mu c$, and imás $=$ ' $\not \mu \varepsilon \nu$; similarly we have in Latin, amic̣us, inimicus; cano, cecini; jacio, abjicio; tango, tetigi; lego, colligo. In open syllables $a$ becomes $i$, while in closed ones it either becomes $e$ or remains $a$, as in abjectus, inermis, expers, tubicen beside tubicinis, and contactus, exactus. As $u$ is lighter than $a$, and heavier than $i$, we have calco, conculco; salsus, insulsus; fructifer beside an older fructufer. As labials prefer $u$, we find oссиро, aucupo, nuncupo, contubernium, \&c. The vowel $u$ in Latin frequently maintains its ground, and does not give way, as in tutudi, pupugi. As ae is heavier than $\hat{\imath}(=i i)$, and au than $\hat{u}(=u u)$ and $\hat{o}$, we have quero, acquiro; claudo, concludo; faux, suffoco. Short $o$ in Latin is lighter than $u$, as we see from corpus, corporis; jecur, jecoris. The oldest forms of words are therefore generally distinguished by the retention of the vowel $a$; for example, Skr. k'atvâras and L. quatuor are older than Gr. $\tau \varepsilon \sigma \sigma a \rho \varepsilon \varsigma$, $\pi i \sigma v \rho \varepsilon \varsigma$, and Goth. fidvôr; Skr. dadâmi than $\delta i ́ \delta \omega \mu \iota$; Skr. dadhâmi than riӨ $\mu \mu$; Skr. naktam (by night) than vúктa. Within the limits of the Sanskrit itself $a$ is frequently reduced to $i$ and $\hat{\imath}, u$ and $\hat{u}$; thus giri (mons) and guru (heavy) from gar; sthitas $=$ L. status, Gr. $\sigma$ тatós; sthitis $=$ Gr. $\sigma \tau$ á $\iota \iota$; hirana (gold), Z. zaranâ; pitâ $=$ Gr. $\pi a \tau \eta{ }^{\prime} ;$ puras $=\mathrm{Gr} . \pi a ́ \rho o s ;$ stîrna from star (sternere) ; pîta (part., præt. pars.) from pâ (to drink); dîrghas = Z. dareghas
 vanishes completely, as in santi $=\mathrm{L}$. sunt, from as (to be); $g^{\prime}$ agmus (3 pl. perf.) from gam (to go). After $v$ and $y$ this frequently occurs, and then these spirants are vocalized into
$u$ and $i$, respectively, as $u k t a$ (part. præt. pass.) from $v a k k^{\prime}$ (to speak) and ishta (part. præt. pass.) from $y a g^{\prime}$ (to sacrifice).

## §. 37. Guna and Vrddif.

Guna (quality) consists in prefixing a short $a$ to any vowel, and Vr $d d h i$ (increase) in prefixing a long $\hat{a}$. We have therefore,

It is only from a comparison of grammatical forms that we can distinguish the guna of $a$ from its vrddhi; e. g. by comparing papâta (he fell) from pat with vivês' $a$ (he entered) from $v i s^{\prime}$, we see that $\hat{a}$ in the former is the guna of $a$, as $\hat{e}$ in the latter is the guna of $i$.

The guna of $i$ is $\hat{e}$, as in êmi $=\varepsilon i j \mu$; vêd $a=o \tilde{i} \delta a$; vêsas $=$
 $i$ is $\hat{a} i$, as in vâis'ya (a man of the third class), from vis' (to enter) ; s'âiva (a worshipper of Siva) from s'iva, \&c.

The guna of $u$ is o, as in bubôdlua (he knew) from budh; sûnôs (gen. sing.) of sûnu (a son), \&cc. The vrddhi of $u$ is $\hat{a} u$, as in bâuddha (a follower of the Bauddha religion) from budh; Bâudha, a son of Budha, \&c.

These examples are sufficient to show what we mean, when we speak of the guna or vrddhi of any vowel.

## §. 38. The Gutturals.

Skr. $k$ is $=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . k: k a s=\mathrm{L} . q u i s=$ Goth. hvas, Gr. $\boldsymbol{k} \boldsymbol{\omega} \mathrm{s}, \kappa \boldsymbol{k}^{\prime}-$ $\tau \varepsilon \rho o \nu$, Ir. cia ; kâla (time), Gr. kaı (death), Gr. ки́ $\rho$, Ir. ceal; kârâ (a prison), L. carcer; kan (to shine), L. candela, Goth. skeina (I shine), Ir. cann (the
full moon). Bopp, Schleicher, and others have asserted that $p$ frequently represents an I. E. $k$, and that consequently we find these sounds interchanged in Sanskrit and the cognate languages: thus we have, Skr. kanth (to mourn), Gr. $\pi \mathfrak{\ell} \nu \theta$ os, $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \mathrm{ov} \theta a$; Skr. kars' (attenuare), L. parco, parcus, parvus; Skr. ka (who), Gr. $\pi$ ó-r£̧ov ; Skr. pâpa (bad), Gr. kakóg, L. pejor for pepjor; Skr. pañk'an = L. quinque ; Skr. pak' (to cook), Gr. $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \omega$, L. coquo. Now, I am fully convinced that $p$ has never been thus developed from an original $k$; but that, wherever these sounds appear to be interchanged, either the original sound was $k v$, or else the change is due to assimilation, and perhaps in one or, two cases to a false analogy. Thus Skr. ka must be derived from an I. E. kva; for we find Skr. kva (where), kutra (where), L. quis and Goth. hvas, all of which point back to an I. E. kva; Skr. k'atvâras, Gr. míov$\rho \in \mathrm{E}$, Lith. keturi, point back to an I. E. kvatvâras, which we find in L. quatuor; Skr. pañk'an, may have been a reduplication of kvan, as L. quinque. In some cases an initial $p$ may have been changed into $k$ or $k v$ by the assimilative power of a succeeding $k$ or $k v$, as some assert to have been the case with L. coquo and quinque: from a comparison, however, of coquo with Lith. kepejas (a baker), and Gr. áртоко́тоs (a baker), it seems possible that the initial $k$ or $k v$ may be original : compare L. coquina = popina, culina for cuclina.*
$K s h(=k s)$ corresponds frequently to $\kappa \tau$ in Greek; here either $k t$ was original, and from it $k s$ arose by weakeñing the explosive sound to a sibilant, or else $k s$ was original, and $s$ became $t$ through the assimilating power of the preceding ex-
 hshan (to hurt), $\kappa \tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$, , $\tau \alpha ́-\mu \varepsilon \nu a l ; ~ h s h i ~(t o ~ r u l e), ~ к \tau a ́ o \mu a l ; ~ k s h i ~$

[^16](to dwell), ктiц $\omega$; aksha (the eye), őкта入入oç. Sometimes also kish corresponds in Greek to $\xi$, and sometimes to $\sigma \chi$, as kshura (a razor), $\xi_{v \rho o ́ v ~ ; ~ k s h u d ~(c o n t e r e r e), ~ \xi u ́ \omega, ~ \xi v \sigma \tau o ́ s, ~ f o r ~}^{\xi v \delta \tau o s ; ~}$ $k s h a d$ (to slaughter), $\sigma \chi a ́ \zeta \omega$; similarly we have kshal (to wash) beside Lith. skalau (I wash), and kshubh (to agitate) beside A. S. be-scufan (contrudere), G. schieben. Sh sometimes disappears, and leaves $k$ or $k h$, as in $k s h u d$ (conterere), L. cudo, incus ; ksham (to endure), колiگ $\omega$; kshudra (small), Lith. kudikis (infans), Pers. kûdek (small) ; khura (a razor), another form of kshura; kshêtra (campus), Goth. haithi (ager), G. heide; kshaya (a house), Ir. cai (a house). K also sometimes disappears, and leaves $s$, as inkshubh (to agitate), W. hwbiau (to make a sudden push), Sl. sübati (to agitate); and perhaps in kshvêl (se movere), O. H. G. suillu (turgeo). Ksh, when not initial, appears often as $g$ in Gothic and English : we have känksh (optare), E. hunger ; pakshin,(a bird), Goth. fugls, E. fowl, aksha (the eye), Goth. augô, E. eye. Ksh, according to Bopp, also appears as $k r$ in Latin and Greek: we have kshapas (night), L. crepus-culum ; kshi (to rule), urukshayas $=\varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \cup к \rho \varepsilon i ́ \omega \nu$; kship (to throw), $\rho i \not \pi \tau \omega$ for крıттн; kshipra (celer), краıт ${ }^{\circ}$ ós.
$K h$ has generally been developed from an older $k$, sometimes through the aspirating influence of a preceding $s$, which has afterwards disappeared: thus we have khang' (to limp), Gr. бкáל $\omega$, O.H.G. hinkan; L. caligo ; khan (to dig), Gr. $\chi$ aì $\omega$, L. canalis, cuniculus, O.H.G. ginêm (hio) ; khad (to slay), L. clades, with linserted, as in Goth. hlaha (I laugh), G. lachen, E. laugh, beside Skr. khakkh (to laugh),* khâd (to eat), Ir. caithim (I eat). Kh also represents an I. E. gh in kha (air), Gr. $\chi$ áos, L. halare, and nakha (a nail), Gr. oैvv , Goth. nagls.
$G=$ I. E. $g: g a r$ (to sound), Gr. $\gamma \eta \rho \tilde{v}^{\omega}, \gamma \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \sigma \sigma a$, L. $g a l-$ lus, garrire. Wherever Skr. $g$ corresponds to $b$ in Greek or

[^17]Latin, the original sound must have been $g v$ : thus we have I. E. gvanâ, Skr. g'anî (a woman), Gr. $\gamma v \nu \eta$ for $\gamma$ Fava, Bœot. ßavá, Ir. bean (a woman), E. quean, queen; I. E. gvam, Skr. gam (to go), Goth. quima (I come), L. venio for gvenio; I. E. gvar, Skr. gar (to devour), Gr. $\beta \rho \dot{\omega} \sigma \kappa \omega$, L. gula, gurges, glutio, voro for gvoro; I. E. gvaru, Skr. guru (heavy), Gr. ßapús, L. gravis; I. E. gvâ, Skr. gô (a cow), Gr. ßoüs, $\gamma^{\prime}$ in $\gamma a-\lambda a$ (for $\gamma a-\lambda a \kappa \tau,{ }^{*}$ which, according to Bopp, meant lac vaccinum, 入акт being the same word as Skr. dugdha,milk), L. bos, ceva; I. E.
 for raa.
$G h=$ I. E. gh : stigh (to mount up), Gr. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon i \chi \omega$, A. S. staeger (a stair) ; Skr. gharma (warm), Sl. gorěti (ardere).
$H$ is a sonant, and therefore cannot have the hard sound generally given to it by English grammarians, perhaps on account of its having a hard sound in Bengali. It never ends a word, and in any other position only stands before vowels, and semivowels, as in hrêsh (to neigh), hnu (to hide), hlâd (to be glad). When it comes before $t$ or $t h$, it changes them into $d h$ or $d h$, as in $d u g d h a$ from $d u h$ (to milk), L. duco, and lîdha from lih (to lick), Gr. $\lambda \varepsilon_{i}^{\prime} \chi \omega$. Hrepresents an I. E. gh in hima (snow), Gr. $\chi \iota \omega$; hari (green), Gr. $\chi \lambda$ ó $\eta$, $h y a s$, Gr. $\chi{ }^{0} \varepsilon_{s}$; an I. E. $d h$ in hitas $=0 \varepsilon$ ós $;$ an I. E. $b h$ in grah, Ved. grabh and mahyam (mihi), beside tubhyam (tibi); and an I. E. $k$ in the single case of $h r d$ (the heart).

## §. 39. The Palatals.

The palatal mutes and nasals have all arisen from the corresponding gutturals; and the palatal sibilant generally stands for an original $k$. It is not known how these letters were

[^18]pronounced in ancient Sanskrit; $k^{\prime}$ may have been sounded either as $t y$ or as $k y$, like the $c$ in E. card, which is frequently pronounced as if it were written cyard.
$K^{\prime}=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k, k u ́=\mathrm{L} . q u e, p e$, in quippe, Goth. $u h, h$ in livasuh (quisque), nil (neque); k'akshus (the eye), Ir. cais (the eye); l'ankl' (vacillare), L. cunctari, Ir. ceangtha (they go) ; k'âurya (furtum), Ir. coire (trespass); k'and (to shine), L. candeo, accendo, scintilla, Goth. skeina (I shine); k'al (to move), Gr. kE $\lambda$ ouat, $\mathrm{k}^{\mathrm{E}} \lambda_{\eta \mathrm{I}}$, L. celer, procella, Ir. caill (a path) ; k'al (nugari), Ir. cal (a joke); k'arman (corium), Gr. ұópıov, L. corium, calceus (?) Ir. croicionn (a skin). In reduplicated syllables $k^{\prime}$ takes the place of $k$, as in $k^{\prime}$ akâra (feci), from $k r$.
$K^{\prime} h=$ I. E. sh, k'hid (to cut), Gr. $\sigma \kappa i \delta \nu \eta \mu u$, L. scindo, Goth. skaida (I separate), Ir. scaithim (I cut off); galk'k'hâmi (I go) for ga-skîami ; pral'h (to ask) from L. precor, I. E. prask.
$G^{\prime}=$ I. E. $g ; g^{\prime}$ ânu = Gr. $\gamma^{\prime}$ vo ; g'val (to burn), Ir. geal (bright), gual (coal), E. coal; g'var (to be sick), L. $\mathfrak{c}$-ger, Ir. gurt (pain); g'nâ (to know), Gr. ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \nu \omega \nu(\gamma) \nu o u ̃ s, ~ L$. (g) nosco, gnarus, i-gnoro, E. know, can, Ir. gnia (knowledge); g'ush (to desire), L. gustus, Goth. kiusu, E. choose, Ir. gus (desire) ; g'ash (to kill), Ir. gus (death), and perhaps L. vasto for gvasto, as vivo for gvivo ; \&c. ; g'an (to produce), Gr. $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\prime} \gamma \mathrm{vo} \mathrm{\mu a}$, L. gigno, genus, E. kin, Ir. genim (I beget); g'anaka (father), from last root, G. könig, E. king. In reduplicated syllables $g^{\prime}$ takes the place of $g$, as in $g^{\prime}$ igâmi $=$ Gr. $\beta \imath \beta \eta \mu \iota$.
$S^{\prime}$ nearly always represents an I. E. $k$, and consequently we find corresponding to it $k$ in Greek and Latin, and $h$ in Gothic. The Lettic and Slavic languages, on the other hand, nearly always present the sibilant, although the guttural is sometimes found, as in Lith. akmen, Sl. kamen, Skr. as'man. We have nas' (to perish), Gr. $\nu_{\text {ékus, }}$ L. nex, nox (the dying away of day); $S^{\prime} r \hat{\imath}$ (the deity of plenty), L. Ceres; s'ravas

[^19]$=\kappa \lambda$ óos; s'vas (to sigh), L. ques-tus, E. wheeze ; s'vêta (white), Goth. hveits, E. white, wheat, "the white plant"; s'ata (a hundred), Gr. Ékaróv for év-катov, L. centum, Goth. hund, W. kant; s'iras and s'îrsha (the head), Gr. кópбך, кápa, L. cerebrum; s'ron̂̂ (the hip), L. clunis: mrs' (to touch), L. mulcere ; s'ad (to fall), L. cadere ; as'man (a stone), as'mara (stony), Gr. äк $\mu \omega \nu$, O. N. hamar (saxum, malleus), E. hammer ; as'vas = Gr. íkos, immos, L. equus, Goth. aihvs, О. S. ehu, Ir. ech ; âs'u (quickly), Gr. ஸ̉кús, L. ocius, accipiter, aquila ; vis' (a man), E. wight ; s'aïk (to doubt), L. cunctari ; bhrs'am (quickly), L. frequens ; s'ana (hemp), O. H. G. hanaf ; s'ans (to say, praise), L. censeo ; s'apha (a hoof), E. hoof ; s'van (a dog), Gr. кv́ $\omega \nu$, Lydian Kavסaú $\lambda_{\eta}$ ( $\sigma \kappa \nu \lambda \lambda о \pi \nu i \kappa \tau \eta s$ ), Median $\sigma \pi a ́ к a, ~ Z . ~ s ' p a ̂ n e m ~(a c c . ~ s i n g),. L . ~ c a n i s, ~$ Goth. hunds, E.hound. In some Sanskrit forms we see the original $k$ kept as in adikshat $=$ ย้סı $\varepsilon \xi_{\varepsilon}$ from dis' (to point out); dik$s h u$, loc. pl. of dis' $^{\prime}$ (a region of the sky). $S^{\prime}$ sometimes takes the place of an original $s$. This is a change not easily explained, but in all cases I believe that it arises either from assimilation, or from the presence of a neighbouring guttural. The second $s^{\prime}$ in $s^{\prime} a s^{\prime} a$ (a hare), from $s^{\prime} a s^{\prime}$ (to leap), represents an original $s$, and has arisen from the assimilative power of the first $s^{\prime}$; the I. E. form was kasa, whence G. hase, E. hare; yet we have the following gloss from Hesychius, $\kappa \varepsilon \kappa \eta \eta_{\nu}{ }_{\varsigma} \lambda a \gamma \omega o u ́ s K_{\rho} \tilde{\eta}_{\tau} \varepsilon \varsigma$, where the second $k$ seems to point back to an I. E. $k$. In s'vas'uras $=$ Gr. غ́кupós, L. socer, the first s' is due to the assimilative power of the second $s^{\prime}$. In the following cases $s^{\prime}$ has sprung from $s$, through the influence of the neighbouring guttural, s'akrt (dung), Gr. $\kappa \kappa \omega ́ \rho$, бкатós, L. stercus ; s'ushka (dry)*, Z. huska, L. siccus; s'ambûka, borrowed from Gr. $\sigma a \mu \beta$ úк $\eta$; kês'a (hair),

[^20]E. hair; kês'ara (juba leonis),* L. casaries. On this principle L. sacer has been connected with s'ak (to be able), but wrongly, if the O. N. hagna (prodesse) be from the latter root. The L. saccharum and E. sugar have been borrowed from Skr. s'arkarâ (gravel, clayed or candied sugar), in which $s^{\prime}$ $=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k$, if L. calculus, calx, Gr. коо́кп, коока́ $\eta$ be connected with it. $S^{\prime}$ was pronounced either as $c h$ in G. mich, or as ssi in E. session. "No simple $s$ can be pronounced at the palatal point. The letter $s$ is formed by the simple friction of the breath between the upper and lower teeth, and is in consequence always dental. The rushing sound of the English $s h$ or the German sch is formed in the hollow space left between the teeth and the palatal point, and may thus be regarded both as a dental and as a palatal sound" (Lepsius' "Standard Alphabet," p. 70).

The palatal nasal was pronounced as $g n$ in Fr. campagne, or as $n$ in E. new.

## §. 40. The Cerebrals.

The presence of the mutes and nasal of this class in Sanskrit has been generally ascribed to the influence of the NonAryan races of India, from whom these letters are supposed to have been borrowed. Bühler $\dagger$ has, however, completely overthrown this theory, and has pointed out that by far the greater number of these cerebrals is produced either by the direct change of $r, s h$, into them, or by the change of dentals into the corresponding cerebrals through the influence of $r$, $r, \hat{r}, s h$, and consequently that cerebralization is entirely an Aryan proceeding, rooted in the ancient phonetic system of

* Bopp derives hair for kés'ara by throwing out the s'. He deduces $k e ̂ s^{\prime} a$ from $k \hat{e}$, loc. of $k a$ (the head), which is found in Gr. кó $\mu \eta$, L. co-ma, ca-pillus, and s'a for s'aya from s'i (to lie); kês'a would then be " quod in capite jacet." If this derivation be correct, $s^{\prime}$ is original here.
$\dagger$ Consult Appendix A.
the language. In Prakrit these cerebral sounds have frequently supplanted the corresponding dentals, as in badi $=$ Skr. prati ( $\pi \varrho 0 \tau i, \pi$ ò $\tau i)$; padhama (first) $=$ Skr. prathama . In transcribing English words the Hindus at present substitute cerebrals for dentals, as in Direktar, Gavarnment, \&c. This shows us that the ordinary English pronunciation of these words is more cerebral than dental.

D has sprung from $s d$ in $n i d a$ (a nest) from $n i$ (under) and $s a d$ (to lie), and therefore means "what lies under ;" L. nidus, E. nest, Ir. nead, W. nyth ; pîd (to press) $=$ pisd $=$ api-sad, compare $\pi l \varepsilon ́ \xi \omega=\dot{\varepsilon} \pi \iota-\sigma \varepsilon \delta y \omega$; bâd and vâd (to bathe) =vasd $=a v a-s a d$, from $a v a$ (down), and sad.

Sh = I. E. $s$; ush (to burn), L. uro for uso, us-si; tarsh (to
 fore $s$ becomes $k$, as in dvèkshi (thou hatest).

## §. 41. The Dentals.

$T=$ I. E. $t$; ta, Gr. тó, L. is-te ; tvam, L. tu; pat (to fly),

$T h=$ I. E. $t$; sthag (to cover), Gr. $\sigma \tau^{\prime} \gamma \omega$, L. tego; sth $\hat{a}$ (to stand), L. sto ; prath (to extend), Gr. $\pi \lambda a \pi i ́ s ;$ asthi (a bone), Gr. ò oréov ; ratha (a car), L. rota, E. rather.
 E. toss; dar (to tear), Gr. סє́ $\rho \omega$, E. tear ; dam (to tame), Gr. $\delta a \mu a ́ \omega$, L. domo, E. tame.
$D h=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . d h$; dhûma (smoke), Gr. $\theta v \mu o ́ s$, L. fumus; dhar (to support), Gr. $\theta \rho a ̈ \nu o s, ~ L . ~ f i r m u s, ~ f o r t i s ~ ; ~ d h r a ̂ k h ~(a r e s-~$ cere), L. fraces (lees of oil), floces (lees of wine), E. dregs, $d r y$; $d h \hat{a}$ (to place*), Gr. $\tau i \theta \eta \mu$, L. con-do, E. do, doom; vádh $\hat{u}$ (a wife), from a root which appears in Zend as vad

[^21](to lead), and which has in Lithuanian the sense of to marry (uxorem ducere), L. vas, vad-is (a contract, as marriage was perhaps the earliest kind of contract known), E. wedding. $D h$ is sometimes reduced to $h$, as in hitas (part. pret. pass. of $d h a \hat{a})=\theta \varepsilon \tau$ ós ; - $-\boldsymbol{i}$ (termination of 2 pers. sing. imper. act.) for $-d h i$ after vowels,* as pâhi (tuere), $-d h i$ is still kept after consonants, as $a d d h i\left(\right.$ eat ), and in Vedic as $s^{\prime} r u d h i=\kappa \lambda \ddot{\nu} \theta_{\iota}$.
$S=$ I. E. $s$; saptan, L. septem; svid (to sweat), Gr. i¿ẹ $\omega$ s, L. sudo, E. sweat ; as (to be), L. esse. $S$ is subject to many changes in Sanskrit; thus after $k, r$, and all the vowels, except $a$ and $\hat{a}$, it becomes $s h$. In certain other cases it is represented by $h, r$, and $s^{\prime}$; but these need not be noticed here, as they properly belong to the special Sanskrit Grammar. The change of $s$ into $r$ occurs also in other languages. In the Laconian dialect, final $\sigma$ became $\rho$, as $\tau i \rho, \pi i \sigma o \rho$, for $\tau i s, \pi i \theta$ os ; and in Latin $s$ between two vowels became $r$, as eram for esam, quorum $=$ Skr. kêshâm (sh for $s$, on account of preceding e), quarum $=$ Skr. kâsâm. $S$ has frequently an aspirating influence on a following consonant, as in sthag, Gr. $\boldsymbol{\sigma} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \hat{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$; sthâ, L. sto ; sphây (to increase), Gr. $\sigma \pi a ́ \omega$, L. spatium; asthi, Gr. ò oréov.
$R+=$ I. E. $r: m a r$ (to die), L. mori. It is sometimes omitted in Sanskrit after an initial consonant, as in blañg' (to break), L. frango; blug' (to enjoy and endure), L. fruor, E. brook; g'hillî (a cricket), L. gryllus, G. grille. We find a similar omission in other languages, as in Pkr. padhama $=$ Skr. prathama ; E. speak $=$ G. sprechen.
$L=\mathrm{I}$. E. $r$, lup (to break), L. rumpo; lok' (to see) from

* The exceptions are $\hat{e} d h i$ (be), $s^{\prime} \dot{\alpha} d h i$ (rule) $g^{\prime} u h u d h i$ (offer). Lidhi (lick) is for liddhi.
$\dagger$ Schleicher and others place $r$ and $l$ among the cerebrals; but, as they appear to be closely connected with the dentals, it is perhaps better to place them among the latter. This question, however, requires a much more complete investigation than it has yet received.
ruch (to shine) ; kalp (to prosper), from karp. $L=I$. E. $l$; see §. 21.*
$N=$ I. E. $n$; nas' (to die), vékves, L. noceo; nara (a man), $\dot{a} \nu \eta \rho_{\rho}, \mathrm{L}$. Nero. . $N$ is frequently changed into another nasal for phonetic reasons; thus we have purna (full), where ? takes the place of $n$, on account of the preceding $r$, and in general the nasal belongs to the same class as the following consonant, as yuñg'anti $=\mathrm{L}$. jungunt, lumpati $=\mathrm{L}$. rumpit.


## §. 42. The Labials.

$P=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . p$; pati (a master), Gr. ঠ̀є $\sigma \pi$ ót $\eta \boldsymbol{c}$ (lit. 'a master of slaves,' Skr. dâsa, a slave) ; pitar, Gr. $\boldsymbol{\pi} a \tau \eta \rho_{\rho}$; pâ (to drink), ${ }^{*}$ Gr. $\pi i v \omega$, L. potus; pyai (to increase), pîvan (fat), Gr. $\pi i \omega \nu \nu$, $\pi i a \rho$, L. pinguis, E. fat ; pis' (to adorn), pềs'alas (beautiful) $=$ Gr. $\pi o \kappa k i \lambda o s, ~ p \hat{u} y$ (to putrefy), Gr. $\pi \tilde{v} o s, \pi v ́ \theta \omega$, L. pus, putris, E. foul; pr̂̂ (to love), Gr. $\pi \rho$ äos, E. friend; pas'u (cattle), Gr. $\pi \bar{\omega} \ddot{u}(?)$, L. pecus, Goth. faihu, A. S. feoh, E. fee.
$P h$ has generally arisen from an I. E. $p$, perhaps through the influence of a preceding $s$, as in sphatika (crystal), G. spath; sphut (to burst), E. split ; sphur (to tremble, to strike), Gr. á $\sigma \pi a i \rho \omega ;$ Skr. phêna (foam), L. spuma, E. foam; phala (fruit) for spala, lit. ' what may be split,' or from bhala, L. flos, E. bloom.

$$
B=\text { I. E. } b(\S .22), \text { or }=\text { I. E. } b h(\S .22) .
$$

$\mathrm{B} h=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . b h$; bhar (to bear), Gr. $\phi \hat{f} \rho \omega$, L. fero; bhid (to cleave), L. findo, E. bite; abhi (towards), Gr. à $\mu \phi \grave{\imath}, \mathrm{E} . b y$. $B h$ is in some cases reduced to $h$, as in grah (to seize), from Ved. grabh, mahyam (to me) $=\mathrm{L}$. mihi, beside tubhyan $=\mathrm{L} . t i b i$.

[^22]$V$ allows consonants to stand after it, which is hardly ever the case with $y$. It is frequently interchanged with $b$. In drapsa (a drop), froin drav (dru gunated), the $v$ is changed into $p$ on account of the following hard $s$, as in Mod. Gr. è $\kappa \lambda a \notin a$ from ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \kappa \lambda a v \sigma a$. The interchange of $b$ and $v$ is of common occurrence, as L. habere, Fr. avoir, L. cantabam, It. cantava; berber (in Salian Hymn) = fervere; Vesuvius = Béoßlos; -ber in Septernber, Skr. vâra (time); Vesontio = Besançon. Bopp considers that $v$ has been hardened into a guttural in the following cases: Skr. g'îv (to live), L. vivo, vixi, E. quick, Skr. bhâyavâmi (I make to be) = L. facio; Skr. dêvaras = L. lêvir, A. S. tâcor, O. H. G. zeihur; Skr. naus = Grr. vaũs, L. navis, A. S. naca, O. H. G. nacho. In this opinion he-appears to be mistaken; and it is far more likely that an original guttural has fallen out in levir and vivo, than that $v$ should have been hardened into one; as to facio, it is not from bhâvayâmi; and in the case of A. S. naca, we have a different termination from the $v a$ in $n \hat{a} u$, which is for snâ-va. 'V, according to Bopp, is sometimes changed into $l$, as in L. - lent $=$ Gr. - F $\varepsilon \nu \tau=$ Skr. $-v a n t$; Skr. svadus (sweet) = Lith. saldius (sweet) ; Skr.svapnas (sleep) $=$ Gr. $v$ v̈ $\nu 0 \varsigma=$ E. sleep.* Similarly $v$ becomes $r$, as in L. cras $=$ Skr. s'vas ; L. ploro = Skr. plâvayâmi; Kr. $\tau \varrho \varepsilon$ ' Skr. tvâm; Goth. driusan (to fall) = Skr. dhvains; O. H. G. pirumes $=$ Skr. bhavâmas; O. H. G. scrirumes = Skr. s'râvayâmas ; Ir. raidim (I say), Goth. rasda (speech), Skr. vad (to speak).
$M=$ I. E. $m$ : manas = Gr. $\mu$ śvos, L. mens ; smar (to remember, L. memor ; as'vam = L. equum ; syâm = L. siem.
§. 43. When one consonant follows another, the law that

* Notwithstanding the parallel case of Lith. saldùs = Skr. svâdus, the connexion of E. sleep with Skr. svapna is very unlikely, on account both of the long vowel (Goth. slêpan O. H. G. slâfan) and the $p$, which should be $f$, according to Grimm's law. Moreover, the root svap appears in O. N. svefn (somnus), O. H. G. sweljan (sopire), A. S. swefian. Lottner connects E. sleep with O. H. G. slaph (languidus).
governs them is this, 'sonants follow sonants only, and surds surds only :' thus vâk' (speech), inst. pl. vâgbhis, yunag'mi (I join), yunakti (he joins) ; admi (I eat), atsi (thou eatest). Only one consonant is permitted to end a word ; when several consonants occur together, all but the first are thrown off: thus, vâk', nom. sing. vâk for vâksh, and this for vâk-s. Tenues alone are allowed as final consonants, the mediæ and aspirates being changed into the corresponding tenuis; but when this final tenuis comes before a word beginning with a sonant or a vowel, it becomes the corresponding sonant, the tenues being therefore retained only before a pause and a following tenuis; thus harit (green), mud (joy), yudh (a fight), become harit, mut, and yut before a pause ; but we have harid bhavati (viridus est), mud bhavati (gaudium est), yud asti (pugna est). For further information on this subject, the reader is referred to the special Sanskrit Grammar.


## CHAPTER V.

## The Greek Alphabet.*

§. 44. Tabular View of the Sounds.

| mutes. |  | SEmivowels. |  |  | vowels. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { unasp. } \\ & \text { surd. son. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { asp. } \\ & \text { surd. } \end{aligned}$ | Spirants. surd. son. | Nasals. son. | $\begin{gathered} r \& l \text {-sounds. } \\ \text { son. } . \end{gathered}$ |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Gutt. } \kappa \quad \gamma \\ & \text { Pal. } \end{aligned}$ | $\chi$ |  | $\gamma$ |  | $\bar{a}\} \in \eta$ ) |
| Cer. |  |  |  | $(\rho, \lambda)$ ? |  |
| Dent. $\tau \quad \hat{\delta}$ | $\theta$ | $\sigma \quad(\sigma)$ | $\nu$ | $\rho, \lambda$ | $\nu \bar{v}$ |
| Lab. $\pi \quad \beta$ | $\phi$ | F | $\mu$ |  | (ov) ) |

$\mathrm{Z}, \xi$, and $\psi$ were called $\sigma \dot{\nu} \mu \phi \omega \nu a \delta \iota \pi \lambda \tilde{a}$; but $\zeta$ differs from $\xi$ and $\psi$ in this, that it is a consonantal diphthong, being equivalent properly to $d y$, while $\xi$ and $\psi$ are merely signs for $\kappa \varsigma$ and $\pi \varsigma$. It is a mistake to suppose that $\zeta$ is equivalent to $\delta \sigma$; for such a combination is impossible, as $\delta$ is a sonant, and $\sigma$ a surd. Before the introduction of the symbols $\xi$ and $\psi$, the Greeks frequently used $\chi \sigma$ and $\phi \sigma$ instead of them. The Romans also must have aspirated the $\kappa$ and $\pi$ in their pronunciation of $\xi$ and $\psi$; for Priscian* writes, " multo molliorem et volubiliorem sonitum habet $\psi$ quam $p s$ vel $b s ; "$ and again, "sicut ergo $\psi$ melius (mollius?) sonat quam $p s$ vel $b s$, sic $x$ etiam quam $g s$ vel $c s . "$ In Zend a similar phenomenon occurs ; thus the nom. sing. of ap (aqua) is $\hat{a} f s$, and of $v \hat{a} k^{\prime}$ (vox), vâkhs. $\Sigma \mathbf{~ s e e m s ~ i n ~ s o m e ~}$ cases to have been soft, as in $\sigma \beta \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \nu v \mu \mu,{ }^{\prime} \sigma \beta$ o ${ }^{\circ}$ os, $\mu i \sigma \gamma \omega, \tilde{v} \sigma \gamma \eta$,



* Böhtlingk (K. Z., vol. xv., p. 148), however, considers that Priscian means that $\psi$ sounded as $b z$, and $x$ as $g z$, as in Fr . examen.
 $\gamma \lambda \omega ́ \tau \tau \eta s$. "A $\phi \omega \nu a$, however, in Plato's language, included both
 the mutes $\left({ }^{\prime} \phi \theta\right.$ or $\gamma$ a) : consult Plato, Kratyl. 424, C.


## §. 45. Pronunciation of the Vowels.

$\Upsilon$ was originally a pure $u$, but in early times it became $\ddot{u}$. This was the first beginning of that tendency in Greek towards allowing the $i$-sound to predominate over the other vowels, which so strongly characterizes Modern Greek. When $v$ became $\ddot{u}$, the pure $u$-sound was expressed by ov. This pure sound was retained by the Bootians; they wrote $\tau$ ov, or тov́v for $\sigma \dot{v}, \kappa \kappa \tilde{v} \mu a$ for $\kappa \tilde{v} \mu a, \gamma \lambda$ оuкои́ for $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa v ́, \& c$. In the Laconian dialect we also find $\tau$ oúv $\begin{aligned} & \text { for } \sigma v \text {, кá } \rho o v a \text { for кápva, }\end{aligned}$
 could not have had this sound in classical Greek, for it was pro-
 possible to pronounce a pure $i$ in that position. The old pure sound of $v$ was kept* in the diphthongs $a v, \varepsilon v$, and $o v$; for these must have arisen in early times, before $v$ had become $\ddot{u}$; and in the cases where $v$ represents $F$, it must have had the sound of the pure $u$. Moreover, if $v$ in these diphthongs had been pronounced $\vec{u}$, the Mod. Gr. pronunciation $a v, e v, o v$, would be inexplicable. -We find also on inscriptions $\phi \varepsilon о \gamma \varepsilon \iota$,
 which forms teach us the same fact. Ov in a later period lost its diphthongal pronunciation, and became a pure $\hat{u}$; this could not have happened, had $v$ in ov been pronounced as $\ddot{u}$. This is corroborated by the fact that the junction of $o$ and $v$ never forms the diphthong ov, but that they are pronounced separately, as in ỏ $\lambda \iota$ чóv̈rtvos. The old name of ô $\mu \iota \kappa \rho o ́ v$ was o $\mathfrak{v}$, and at Athens, before Ol . 100, o was always written in place

[^23]of the later ou, where this ou arose either from contraction, or from mere lengthening, whether arising from the falling out of a consonant, or from any other cause, wherever, therefore, the Doric had $\omega$ : on the other hand, ov was written wherever $v$ was original, whether as representing $F$ or for some other reason; thus we have ros for roús, from rovs, єк то коıvo for ๕к тои̃ коเขoũ, \&c., but always oủк and oũ̃os, in both of which words the Doric has also ov.* In early times o was used to express both the long and short clear $O$ and the long and short obscure $o$. The latter sound became $\hat{u}$ (ov), the former $\omega(=00)$. The clear sound prevailed in early times, and hence
 lengthened to compensate for the throwing out of the consonants at a time when it still had the clear sound. The augment $\varepsilon$ before o coalesced with this o into $\omega$, for this change likewise occurred at an early period. On the other hand, in тoús for $\tau 0 \nu \varsigma, \lambda_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \gamma o v \sigma \iota$ for $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma o \nu \tau \iota$, the $\nu$ remained in long; and when it was thrown out o had become obscure, and therefore the $u$-sound (ov) took its place. Similarly in Old Latin, o had both a clear and an obscure sound: the obscure o became $u$, as in legunt, vulgus, from O. L. legont, volgus, while the clear o remained unchanged, as in colo, honestus. When o was succeeded by a vowel, it in some cases seems to have had the sound of $w$; thus we have, óá for the Persian wah, "Oa $\xi_{o s}$ for Fá $\xi_{o s, ~ o ̋ a r ı ı s ~ f r o m ~ A r . ~ w a d i, ~ \delta o a ́ \nu ~ f o r ~}^{\text {of }} \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu$, Koîvtıos for Quinctius, and perhaps in olorpos, the gadfly, so called from its whizzing noise.

As o was written ou before the Archonship of Eukleides, so $\varepsilon$ was written for $\varepsilon \iota$. E九 was however written in full where-
 but where $\varepsilon \iota$ arose either from contraction or any other cause, $\varepsilon$ is found, as in $\pi 0 \lambda \varepsilon \varsigma$ for $\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon \iota \varsigma, \varepsilon \rho \gamma a \sigma \tau \alpha \iota$ for $\varepsilon \ell \rho \gamma a \sigma \tau \alpha \iota, \kappa \lambda \varepsilon-$
 the Eolians wrote $\eta$ for $\varepsilon$, as in $\sigma \nu \mu \phi \varepsilon_{\imath} \rho \eta \nu$, Хí $\rho$, т $\rho \tilde{\eta} \varsigma$. We

[^24]find one exception to this rule; for on inscriptions we find $\varepsilon \iota \pi \varepsilon \nu$ for $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon \nu \nu$ and $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon i \nu$, though the root $F \varepsilon \pi$ contains no $\iota$ originally ; the Æolians also wrote $\varepsilon i \pi \eta \nu$ for $\varepsilon i \pi \varepsilon i \nu$. E had two sounds in early Greek, the one approaching $a\left(e^{a}\right)$, the other approaching $i\left(e^{i}\right) ; e^{a}$, when lengthened, became $\boldsymbol{\eta}$, and $e^{i}$, $\varepsilon$. The former sound was older than the latter; and hence, when phonetic changes requiring $\varepsilon$ to be lengthened occurred in early times, it became $\eta$, whereas in changes, of later origin

 for the consonants in these cases were not thrown out till late; $-\eta \rho,-\eta \nu,-\eta \varsigma$ (in ai ${ }^{i} \dot{\eta} \rho, \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \rho \eta \nu, \varepsilon \dot{v} \gamma \varepsilon \nu \eta \eta_{\zeta}$ ), for $-\varepsilon \rho \varsigma,-\varepsilon \nu \varsigma,-\varepsilon \sigma \varsigma$,
 cases the nom. sing. $\sigma$ was early lost, while in the latter $\nu$ remained in till a later period.

The Bœotic is a stage in advance of the Attic, for in it we find $\varepsilon \iota$ for $\eta$, as in $£ \beta \delta$ о $\mu \varepsilon i к о \nu \tau a$, where $-\mu \varepsilon \iota-$ for $-\mu a-$ must have passed through the stage $-\mu \eta-, \pi \varepsilon ́ \nu \varepsilon \iota s$ for $\pi \varepsilon \quad \nu \eta \eta_{s}, ~ \tau i \theta \varepsilon \iota \mu \iota$
 and $i$ for $\varepsilon \iota$, as in $\lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \iota s$ for $\lambda \varepsilon \neq \varepsilon \iota s$, $\eta_{i} \iota$ for aıź. While $\varepsilon \iota$ in Greek, and ei in Latin gradually approached $\hat{\imath}$ in pronunciation, the English $\hat{\imath}$ conversely is pronounced as $e i$; similarly, while ov in Greek and ou in Latin approached $\hat{u}$, the N. H. G. $a u$ has been developed from the M. H. G. $\hat{u}$, as in haus from hus. $H$ in classical Greek never could have had the sound of $\hat{\imath}$, for the bleating of sheep is represented by $\beta \tilde{\eta}$. The diphthongs $a v$ and oc were probably pronounced as E. ou and ee; for in Aristophanes (Vesp. 903), a dog's bark is a $\tilde{v}$, aṽ , and a bird's note is $\pi 0 i ̈$ (Aves, 227), compare E. pewit.

## §. 46 Pronunciation of the Aspirates.*

The aspirates were originally hard sounds; for before the introduction of the signs, $\theta, \chi, \phi$, they were written, TH,

[^25]КН, ПН, as in EПEYKHOMENO』, EKПHANTOI, on the Columna Naniana ; moreover, we find them reduplicated by the tenues, as in $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$, кє́ $\chi$ vка; and in addition, when the Ionic dialect separated from the parent stock, they must have been hard, for we frequently find them represented in it by the tenues. These hard aspirates were originally soft, and traces of this fact still manifest themselves, as in $\Phi$ ८ठáкv $\eta$
 gularly reduplicated form of the same root as the Skr. bhî (timere). Curtius attempts to account for the origin of these hard aspirates from the I. E. $g h, d h$, and $l h$, by supposing that the $h$ in these latter was hard, and that it assimilated to itself the preceding mediæ, just as $\beta$ in R. $\beta \lambda a \beta$ becomes $\pi$ before $\tau$ in $\beta \lambda a \pi \tau$ ós. This explanation is, however, perfectly untenable. The aspirates were also in classical Greek actually double sounds, as we see (1) from the moveableness of the aspiration in reduplicated syllables, in $\theta \rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \psi \omega$ from $\tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \phi \omega$, in Ion. $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \nu \theta a \tilde{v} \tau a=\dot{\varepsilon} \nu \tau a \tilde{v} \theta a$, Ion. $\kappa \iota \theta \dot{\omega} \nu=\chi \iota \tau \dot{\omega} \nu$, in $\dot{a} \phi ’$ oṽ from $\dot{a} \pi{ }^{\prime}$ oṽ, \&c. ; (2) from the way in which Barbarians pronounced Greek, as airgíav, $\pi u \lambda a ́ \xi \iota ~(T h e s m o p h . ~ 1001, ~ s e q),. ~ o ̋ \rho \nu ı \tau о ~$ (Aves, 1678) ; (3) from the way in which they were transliterated in the older Latin, where $t=\theta, c=\chi, p$ or $b=\phi$, as in tesaurus, Corintus, tiasus, calx (= $\left.\chi^{\prime} \lambda_{\iota} \xi\right)$, Nicomacus, Aciles, Poinos $(=\Phi о i ̈ \nu \imath \xi)$, Pilemo $(=\Phi \iota \lambda \hat{\imath} \mu \omega \nu)$, Nicepor ( $=$ Nt-
 ( $=\Phi \rho \boldsymbol{q}_{\gamma \varepsilon \varsigma}$ ) ; (4) Dionysius of Halikarnassus states that in the case of the aspirates there was a $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \theta \dot{\eta} \kappa \eta$ тov $\pi \nu \varepsilon v ́ \mu a \tau o s ;$ (5) in Modern Greek in some cases the tenuis represents the old aspirate, which could not be accounted for if $\theta, \chi, \phi$ had been spirants, as $\varepsilon$ हैк $\omega$, бтока́द̆онає, тєкvíтทs in Rhodian dialect, $\tau \varepsilon ́ \lambda \omega=\theta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \omega$ among Asiatic Greeks, and $\lambda \varepsilon v \tau \varepsilon \rho o ́ v \omega=\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon v \theta \varepsilon-$ @ó $\omega$, in the Peloponnesus. Those who disagree with the preceding view of the aspirates bring forward in support of their opinion, that they were not true aspirates, the fact that we find such combinations as $\phi \lambda, \chi \theta, \phi \theta, \chi s$ ( $=\xi$ anciently),
and ask how could these be pronounced if $\theta, \chi$, and $\phi$ were true aspirates. But this is a very unsafe foundation on which to build; for we are not likely to be good judges of what the ancient Greeks could pronounce, and the mere fact that we are unable to pronounce a certain combination of letters does not prove that others could not pronounce it. The statement of Priscian, that the only difference between $f$ and $\phi$ was that $\phi$ was pronounced fixis labris, only proves that in his time $\phi$ had become a spirant -not, however, a labiodental like $f$ and Mod. Gr. $\phi$, but rather an interlabial.

## §. 47. The Vowels.

 from R. $\gamma \varepsilon \nu$, Skr. $g^{\prime} a n$; $\pi i \pi \tau \omega$ for $\pi \iota \pi \varepsilon \tau \omega$ from R. $\pi \varepsilon \tau$, Skr. pat (to fall) ; $\pi a \tau \varrho o ́ s=$ Hom. $\pi a \tau$ ¢́pos. It is generally retained, when it is initial, as in ${ }_{\xi}^{\xi} \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu=$ Skr. smas (we are), L. sumus ; દì $\nu \nu=$ Skr. syâm, L. siem.
$\breve{a}=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} \cdot \breve{a}: \dot{a} \pi \grave{o}=\mathrm{L} . a b=$ Skr. $a p a$ (away); ${ }^{2} \kappa \omega \nu, \mathrm{~L} . a c u s$, acies; ס́ákov, Skr. as'ru(a tear); ä $\omega \omega$, L. ago, Skr. $a g^{\prime}$ (to go).

 padam, $\pi a \tau \varepsilon \varrho a=$ Skr. pitaram.
$\varepsilon=\mathrm{I}$. E. $\breve{a}: ~ \hat{\varepsilon} \sigma \tau \iota=$ Skr. asti; $\phi \hat{q} \rho \omega=$ Skr bharâmi; $\tau \in \tau-$ $\tau a \rho \varepsilon \varsigma=$ Skr. k'atvâras; $\phi \lambda \varepsilon^{\prime} \gamma \omega$, L. Alagro; $\pi a \tau \notin \rho a=$ Skr. pitaram; ${ }^{\prime} \chi \nsucc \varsigma$, L. anguis. We find $\varepsilon$ and $a$ standing beside each other in many grammatical forms: $\tau \varepsilon ́ \mu \nu \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \tau a \mu \nu \nu ; \tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \pi \omega$,
 $\mu a \iota$. In the dialects $\varepsilon$ and $a$ are frequently interchanged;




 $\breve{a}=$ Att. $\varepsilon$, so Doric $\bar{a}=$ Ion. and Att. $\eta$, wherever this $\eta$ re-
presents an original a. So also $\eta=$ Skr. $\hat{a}$, as $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota=$ Skr. dadhâmi.
 thas (a path) ; $\pi$ óvıs $=$ Skr. patis $($ a master $) ; \mu$ '́vos $=$ Skr. manas (mind). In the dialects we find $o$ and $a$ frequently inter-

 haps represents the original Fa; ímó, Æol. íváa ; àvá, Æol. òv;


 beside $\tau \varepsilon \kappa \tau о \nu ; a ̊ \mu a$ beside ómós, \&c. As Dor. $a=$ Att. o, so Doric $\bar{\alpha}=$ Att. $\omega$, as in Dor. $\pi \rho a ̃ \tau o s ~ f o r ~ \pi \rho \omega ̈ ̃ o s, ~ D o r . ~ \theta \varepsilon a \rho o ́ s ~ f o r ~ \theta \varepsilon \omega \rho o ́ s . ~$ So also $\omega=$ Skr. $\hat{a}$, as in סío $\omega \mu \iota=$ Skr. dadâmi. In some cases



$\imath=$ I. E. $i$ : ${ }_{\imath} \quad-\mu \varepsilon \nu$, R. $\imath$, Skr. imasi (we go) ; $\lambda \varepsilon i ́ \pi \omega$, R. $\lambda \iota \pi$, Skr. rik' (to leave), L. linguo; ò $\mu \iota \chi \varepsilon \imath \nu$, R. $\mu \iota \chi$, Skr. mih (mingere).
$\iota=\mathrm{I}$. E. $a: a$ then passed through the intermediate stage $\varepsilon$, and in many cases we find side-forms containing both $\varepsilon$ and $\iota$ : thus we have $\grave{i} \lambda \lambda \omega$ beside $\grave{\varepsilon} \lambda \dot{v} \omega$, кị $\rho \nu \eta \mu \iota$ beside $\kappa \varepsilon \rho a ́ \nu \nu v \mu \iota$, $\kappa \tau i ́ \nu \nu \nu \mu \iota$ beside $\kappa \tau \varepsilon ́ \iota \nu \omega, \kappa \tau \dot{\alpha} \mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota, \pi i ́ \lambda \nu a \mu a \iota$ beside $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda a \varsigma, \pi \iota \tau \nu \eta \mu \iota$

 these side-forms in $\varepsilon$ do not exist: $i \pi \pi \%$ os $=$ Skr. as'vas, L . equus; крìv beside L. cerno; poíl a beside L. radix. $\mathrm{I}=a$ in reduplicated present tenses, as $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota=$ Skr. dadhâmi, $\pi i \pi \tau \omega$ from R. $\pi \varepsilon \tau$, тíкт $\omega$ from R. $\tau \varepsilon \kappa$ for $\tau \iota \tau \kappa \omega$. E and $\iota$ are frequently interchanged in the dialects: Bœot. $i \omega \omega \nu=\varepsilon^{\prime} \omega \prime \nu$, R. $\varepsilon \varsigma$; Lak. $\sigma \dot{\prime} a$ $=\theta \varepsilon a ́ ;$ Kret. $\theta \iota o ́ s=\theta$ zós ; Dor. í $\sigma$ ría, Ion. i $\sigma$ тí $=$ é $\sigma$ ría ; Arkad.

 Ahrens considers that $\iota$ is changed into $\varepsilon$ on account of the fol-
lowing $\rho$, as in L. tertius, and pronunciation of E. third. Although an I. E. $a$ can thus be weakened to $i$, the converse never occurs; this rule has long been known; for in the
 тৎє́тєтац.
$v=$ I. E. $u: \phi \dot{v} \omega$, Skr. bhu (to be) ; '̀ки́s = Skr. âs'us (quick); そuरóv = Skr. yugam (a yoke) ; к $\lambda \boldsymbol{v} \omega$, Skr. s'ru (to hear) ; suffix $-\tau v$ in $\beta_{o \eta \tau}$ ús, \&c., = Skr. Lith. and L. -tu.
$v=\mathrm{I}$. E. $a: a$ then passed through the intermediate stage $o$, and in numerous examples o and $v$ stand beside each other, while the Latin corresponding forms have sometimes not advanced beyond the $o$-stage, though, as we have already remarked, the Latin has generally advanced to the $u$-stage, even in cases where the Greek still keeps o; $\lambda$ úros, L. lupus, from an I. E. varkas, as may be inferred from Skr. vrrka (wolf); $\mu о \rho \mu \nu ́ \rho \omega$, L. mürmur, Skr. marmara (murmur) ; $\mu v ́ \lambda \eta$, L. molo, Lith. malunas (a mill), which are all derived by Max Müller from an I. E. mar (to rub down), with which he also connects $\mu a ́ \rho v a \mu a t, \mu \tilde{\omega} \lambda o s{ }^{~ " A \rho \eta o s ~(t h e ~ t o i l ~ a n d ~ m o i l ~ o f ~ A r e s), ~} \mu \dot{\omega} \lambda \omega \psi$ (a weal), L. mors, \&c.; vú $\xi$, L. nox, Skr. naktam (by night); $\sigma^{\sigma} \nu, \xi \check{v} \nu$, L. con, cum, Skr. sam (with) ; ${ }^{\circ} \nu v \xi$, Skr. nakha (a
 wheel); ávévvuos beside ơvo $\mu a$, Skr. nâman (a name); the suffix - $\tau v \rho$ in $\mu a ́ \rho \tau v \rho$ beside $-\tau о \rho$, nom. $-\tau \omega \rho$, as in L. daturus beside dator; $\pi \rho$ и́raves from $\pi \rho o$ ( $\pi \rho$ о́тavios is found on a Lesbian inscription), the termination being found in $\varepsilon \pi \eta \varepsilon-$ тavós, and L. diutinus. In $\gamma v \nu \dot{\prime} v$ represents an older Fa , as we see from Bœot. ßavá. In Æolic $v$ frequently takes the


 $=\pi о ́ т а \mu о \varsigma ; ~ \delta \varepsilon \bar{v} \rho v=\delta \varepsilon \bar{v} \rho o$. In Æolic we also find $v$ for $\omega: \tau \varepsilon \in \kappa \tau \nu \nu=\tau \varepsilon ́ \kappa \tau \omega \nu ; \chi \varepsilon \lambda \hat{\nu} \nu \eta=\chi^{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega \hat{\omega} \nu \eta$ (compare ${ }^{\bullet} \phi \dot{\omega} \rho=\mathrm{L}$.


$\tau a$（entrails）；and $v$ for o in Ion．$\rho \cup \phi^{\prime} \omega=\rho_{\rho} о \phi^{\prime} \omega$ ．The Bœotic dialect often substitutes $v$ for ot，and $\boldsymbol{\varphi}$ ，as in Füко $=$ Foïко, ， $\delta a ́ \mu v=\delta \dot{\eta} \mu \varphi:$ in these cases the o－sound became $u$ ，and then $u i$ became $i$ ．The old Latin oitier must similarly have passed through uitier in becoming uti：the only difference being that the Latin $u$ is a true $u$ ，while the Greek $v$ is $u$ ．It is remark－ able that the Bœotic also agrees with the Latin in sometimes representing o七 by oc，as in $\Delta \iota o v v ́ \sigma o \varepsilon=\Delta \iota o v v ́ \sigma \psi$ ．We find $v$ for $o$ in the Arkadian genitive in－av（弓amıav）from－ $\bar{a} o,-\bar{a} o s$ $=$ Skr．$-\hat{a} y \hat{a} s . *$

The old $u$ having become $v$（ $i i$ ），in some cases advanced a step farther and became $\imath$ ：фїтvs（a father），фı兀⿱㇒v́ $\omega$ from R．$\phi v$ ；
 кіркоз（a ring），beside ки́клоя，R．кию，from which root come also Kє́ $\kappa \boldsymbol{v} \rho \boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and кє́ ккос（a tail），$\varepsilon$ arising from $\iota$ through the influence of the following $\rho$ ；$\psi$ 亿vóós（slanderous），from $\psi v ́ \theta o s$（a lie）；$\mu i ́ \tau v \lambda o c s$ and $\mu v ́ \tau \iota \lambda o s ~(c u r t a i l e d), ~ L . ~ m u t i l u s ~ ; ~$ סpíos（copsewood），from $\delta \rho \tilde{v} s$ ；$\theta i a \sigma o s$（a band），from R．$\theta v$ ， with same suffix as in $\pi$ ย́тaros ；$\beta \dot{i} \beta \lambda_{\text {os }}$ from $\beta \dot{v} \beta \lambda_{o s}$（papy－ rus）；ò $\lambda_{\iota} \beta$ oós（slippery），beside L．lubricus；$\mu 0 \lambda_{\imath} \beta \delta_{\text {ós }}$ beside $\mu о \lambda \nu \beta$ óós ；$\lambda i ́ \pi t \tau \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\imath}$（I am eager），R．$\lambda_{\iota} \phi$ ，Skr．lubhyâmi（I desire），L．lubet and libet．We also find Æol．iqos，ït $\rho$ ， ${ }^{\prime} \pi a \rho$ for $\dot{v} \psi \circ \rho, \dot{v} \pi \notin \rho, \nu i \pi a \rho$ ．

## §．48．Guna and Vṛddhi．

The guna of $\iota$ is $\varepsilon \iota$ ，and in a few isolated cases at；its vrddhi is ot，o here representing a Skr．$\hat{a}$ ．The guna of $v$ is $\varepsilon v$ and $a v$ ；its vrddhi is ov and $\bar{a} v$ ．The I．E．$a$ is represented in Greek by $a, \varepsilon, o$ ；its guna is $o, \bar{a}$ ，and $\eta$ ；its vrddhi is $\omega$ ．

| Primitive vowels | $\varepsilon$ | $\circ$ | $a$ | $\iota$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guna | $\circ \bar{a} \eta$ | $\varepsilon \iota(a \iota)$ | $\varepsilon v(a v)$ |  |
| Vrddhi | $\omega$ | $o \iota$ | $o v(\bar{a} v)$ |  |

[^26]

 dadars'a. In $\mu^{\prime} \mu \eta \lambda a$ beside $\mu_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda \varepsilon \iota$, R. $\mu \varepsilon \lambda, \eta$ appears to be the guna of $\varepsilon$ of the root.

The guna of $a$ of the root is $\bar{a}$ or $\eta ;$ R. $\lambda a \theta,{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \lambda a \theta o \nu$,



The guna of $o$ is $\bar{a}$ or $\eta$ : véos $=$ Skr. navas (new), $\nu \varepsilon \bar{a}$, Ion. $\nu \hat{\prime} \dot{\eta}=$ Skr. navâ, and similar cases.


 ä $\gamma \omega$, ả $\gamma \omega \gamma \eta$; R. $\delta 0$, $\delta i ́ \delta o \mu \varepsilon \nu$, $\delta i ́ \delta \omega \mu \iota$; R. ó $\delta$, ỏ $\delta \mu \dot{\eta}$, ő $\delta \omega \delta \alpha$; L. $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta$ (to eat), $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \delta \omega \omega \delta \dot{\eta}$.

The guna and vrddhi of $\iota$ are $\varepsilon \iota$ and $o \iota ;$ R. $i, \imath^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu=$ Skr.





 $\lambda \iota \chi \mu a ́ \omega$ (I lick), $\lambda \varepsilon i \chi \omega$. In ai $\theta_{\varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota ~(t o ~ b u r n), ~ a \iota ~ i s ~ t h e ~ g u n a ~}^{\text {a }}$ of $\iota$; for it is connected with Skr. indh (to burn), L. cestus, O. H. G. eit (fire). The vrddhi of this root may be found in oíropos (the gadfly), as G. bremse (the horsefly), comes from brennen (to burn), and L. tabanus is connected with Skr. tap (to burn).

The guna and vrddhi of $v$ are $\varepsilon v$ and $o v$, but $\varepsilon v$ nearly always


 $\lambda o v \pi \sigma \sigma o \nu$ (the white pith of the fir tree) ; R. $\pi \nu v, \pi \nu v^{\prime} F \omega$,


Schleicher considers $a v$ to be the guna of $v$ in $a v \not \omega$ (Ikindle), for av̉ $\sigma \omega$, beside $\varepsilon v ้ \omega$ (I singe), Skr. ush (to burn), ôshami (I burn), L. uro for uso; in à̉ $\gamma^{\prime}$ (splendour) beside Skr. ôg'as (strength and splendour); and in $\boldsymbol{a} \boldsymbol{v} \xi_{a \nu \omega}$ from R. $v \boldsymbol{\gamma}$, beside Skr. ug-ra (strong). In the first two of these examples, however, he is probably wrong, and in the last certainly so; for Skr. ush is from an older vas, which is found in vâsara (a day), $\hat{o} g^{\prime} a s$ is from $v a g^{\prime}$ (to strengthen), L. vigere, vegere, and aủ $\xi^{\prime} \nu \omega$ from R. Fa , Skr. vakshâmi (I grow), Goth. vahsja (I grow). In the first two cases the old $\mathbf{F} a$ probably became $a \mathbf{F}$ by transposition, and then $a v$, and in the last case we find Hom. $\boldsymbol{a} \in \mathfrak{\xi} \boldsymbol{\xi} \omega$ $=a \ddot{u} \xi_{\omega}$, which points back to a form $\dot{\alpha} F_{\varepsilon} \xi_{\omega}$, where $\varepsilon$ is merely a help-vowel, and where we find $a$ and $F$ already transposed. If $\nu a \tilde{v} s$, Ion. $\nu \eta \tilde{v} \bar{s}$, comes from R. $\sigma \nu v$, Skr. snu (to flow), $\bar{u} v$ is here the vrdhhi of $v$ : on the other hand, if it comes from R. $\sigma v \bar{a}$, Skr. snâ (to bathe), it is formed like yoa $\tilde{v} s$, and $\bar{a} v$ is therefore not the vrddhi of $v . *$ In the following cases $\omega$ appears to be the vrddhi of $v$; $\zeta \omega \mu$ ós (broth) beside $\zeta \dot{v} \mu \eta$ (leaven), L. jus; ఢ'́vvvvuı (I gird), from R. ఢv; $\chi^{\omega} \nu \nu v \nu \mu \iota(I$ heap up) from R. $\chi$. Curtius considers that $\omega$ arose from $v$ through the intermediate step oF. Schleicher's view is that, as we have Ion. $\pi \lambda \omega \dot{\omega} \omega$ for $\pi \lambda \omega \dot{F} \omega$ beside $\pi \lambda \hat{\xi} F \omega$, and Dor. $\beta \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$ $=\beta o u ̈ s=$ Skr. gâus, and Ionic diphthong $\omega v$ for $a v$, so there once, as vrddhi of $v$, existed $\omega v=$ Skr. $\hat{a} u$, the first element of which gradually assimilated to itself the second, so that finally only the $o$-sound was heard.

We must carefully distinguish from the diphthongs arising from guna and vrddhi, those which arise from contraction or from compensation for the loss of consonants or from the vocalization and hyperthesis of the original spirants $y$ and $v$.
§. 49. When a consonant or consonants are thrown out of a word, the preceding vowel is generally lengthened, to compensate for the loss of the consonants. Thus a becomes

[^27]$\bar{a}$ in $\pi u \dot{\lambda} \bar{a} \varsigma($ acc. pl. $)=\pi v ́ \lambda a \nu \varsigma, \& c ., \quad i \sigma \tau \alpha ́ \varrho=i \sigma \tau a \nu \tau \varsigma, \& c . ; a$ becomes $\boldsymbol{a} \iota$ in the Lesbian Eolic acc. pl. term. -aıs $=$ Kret. $-\boldsymbol{\alpha \nu}$, as $\tau$ aís $=$ Kret. $\tau a ́ v c ̧, ~ a l s o ~ i n ~ L e s b . ~ Æ o l . ~ \tau a ́ \lambda a ı s ~=~ \tau a \lambda a v s, ~ \pi a i ̈ s ~$
 $=\delta \varepsilon \iota \kappa \nu v \nu \tau \varsigma ; ~ \varepsilon$ becomes $\eta$ in $\pi a \tau \eta \rho=\pi a \tau \varepsilon \rho \varsigma, \pi о \iota \eta \eta=\pi о \iota \mu \nu \nu$, $\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \eta \eta_{S}=\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \sigma s ; ~ \varepsilon$ becomes $\varepsilon \iota$ in $\tau \ell \theta \varepsilon i ́ s=$ Kret. $\tau \ell \theta^{\prime} \nu c$ for


 becomes $\omega$ in $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{v} \pi \tau \omega \nu=\tau v \pi \tau 0 \nu \tau \varsigma, \dot{\eta} \gamma \dot{\eta} \tau \omega \rho$ (a leader) $=\hat{\eta} \gamma \eta \tau \circ \rho \rho$;



 have already pointed out that, when a consonant was lost in early times, and compensation was made for it, $\varepsilon$ became $\eta$, and $o$ became $\omega$; but that, on the other hand, when the loss did not occur till a later period, $\varepsilon$ became $\varepsilon$, and o became ov. The examples from the dialects above quoted confirm this account of the matter; for we find that the consonants are frequently kept by them in the latter case, but never in the former.
§. 50. The vowels $\iota$ and $u$, when coming after a semivowel, are frequently thrown back by hyperthesis. Thus, $\phi \varepsilon ́ \rho \varepsilon \iota \varsigma=\phi \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \sigma \iota=$ I. E. bharasi $; \boldsymbol{v} \pi \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \boldsymbol{\rho} \rho=\boldsymbol{v} \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota=$ Skr. upari (above), Z. upairi (above) ; ह̀ $\lambda a v ́ \nu \omega=\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda a \nu v \omega$. In the first stage of hyperthesis, the vowel is not only reflected, but also kept in its original place, as in Zend, where we find upairi (above), bavaiti = Skr. bhavati (he is), \&c. In Ion. $\pi o v \lambda u ́ s=\pi o \lambda u ́ s$, and Ep. $\varepsilon$ iví $=$ éví, $\pi \lambda a i \sigma \iota o v$ (a square) $=\pi \lambda a-$ $\theta \iota o \nu$ (from R. $\pi \lambda a \tau$, whence comes $\pi \lambda a \tau u ́ s$ ), aiфvídıos = ả $\phi \nu i ́-$ $\delta_{\iota o s}$ (compare á $\phi \nu \omega$ ), we have this stage of hyperthesis. When the original spirants $y$ and $v$ come after $v$ and $\rho$, they are generally vocalized and thrown back. Thus $\mu \varepsilon \lambda^{\prime} \alpha \iota \nu a=\mu \varepsilon \lambda a \nu y a$;

 tarvos; $\nu \varepsilon \tilde{v} \rho \circ \nu=\nu \varepsilon \rho F o v$, L. nervus ; $\gamma$ aũ $\rho o s$ (proud) $=\gamma \ldots \rho$ Fos, Skr. garva (pride) ; Ion. oũ $\lambda o s$ (for ü $\lambda o s$ ) $=\dot{\delta} \lambda$ Fos $=$ Skr. sarvas (all), L. salvus, sollus; $\pi a \tilde{v} \rho o s=\pi a \rho F o s$, L. parvus; $\kappa \rho i v \omega(\bar{\imath})=\kappa \rho \iota \nu y \omega$, たol. крívv $; \pi \lambda \dot{\prime} \nu \omega(\bar{v})=\pi \lambda \nu \nu \mathrm{y} \omega ; \iota+\iota$ becoming $\bar{i}$, and $v \iota, v$. In one case $y$ after $\lambda$ is vocalized and thrown back, ó óí $\lambda \omega=\dot{o} \phi \varepsilon \lambda y \omega$, Hom. ó $\phi \varepsilon ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$. We have traces of the older hyperthesis in ковí $\sigma \omega \nu=\kappa \rho \varepsilon \iota \tau J \omega \nu$ for $\kappa \rho \varepsilon \tau y o \nu \varsigma$, New. Ion. клє́ $\sigma \sigma \omega \nu$; $\mu \varepsilon i \zeta \omega \nu=\mu \varepsilon \iota \gamma \bar{\prime} \omega \nu$ for $\mu \varepsilon \gamma$-уovs, New Ion. $\mu \varepsilon ́ \zeta \omega \nu ; \mu \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu=\mu a \iota \lambda$ yov, $\theta a \tilde{\sigma} \sigma \sigma o v=\theta a \iota \chi$ Јov, where $\breve{a}$ becomes $\bar{\alpha}$, on account of the loss of $\imath$. In крєíन $\sigma \omega \nu, \mu \varepsilon i \zeta \omega \nu$, and $\theta a \ddot{a} \sigma \sigma o v$, we find hyperthesis of $y$ over mutes. We find $\iota$ thrown back also in the following cases when a mute precedes: $\gamma v \nu a \iota \kappa^{-}=\gamma v \nu a \kappa \iota-=$ I. E. ganak̂̂ ; aik (a goat), stem $a i \gamma-=\dot{\alpha} \gamma \iota-$, Skr. $a g^{\prime} \hat{a}$ (a goat); $\varepsilon^{\prime} \xi a i ́ \phi \nu \eta s=\dot{\xi} \xi a \pi i \nu \nu \eta$;
 $=\delta \varepsilon \pi \iota \nu o \nu$ or $\delta a \pi \iota \nu o \nu$ L. dapinare ; $\dot{\rho}$ oï $\beta \delta o s=\dot{\rho} \circ \beta \delta$ yos (Hesychius has the form $\dot{\rho} о \beta \delta \varepsilon \tilde{\imath})$; $a \mathfrak{i} \chi \mu \eta=\dot{\alpha} \kappa \iota \mu \eta$, R. $\dot{a} \kappa$, compare ảkís (a point) ; ail $\gamma \lambda \eta$ (light) $=\dot{a} \gamma \iota \lambda \eta$, R. ả $\gamma$, compare Skr. agnis (fire) $=$ L. ignis, the termination being the same as that

 $\nu o s$; Ep. $\pi \varepsilon i \kappa \kappa \omega$ (I comb) from $\pi \varepsilon \kappa y \omega$ beside $\pi \varepsilon \kappa \kappa \omega$.
§. 51. We frequently find a vowel prefixed to many Greek words, which is absent in the corresponding words in the cognate languages. This phenomenon was called by the old grammarians $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \theta \varepsilon \sigma t s$. Curtius points out that this prosthetic vowel is generally found before double consonants, nasals, $\lambda, \rho$, and $\mathbf{F}$, seldom before explosives, and never before single $\pi, \tau$, and $\phi$. Thus we have $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \kappa a i \rho \omega$ (I skip) $=\sigma \kappa a i \rho \omega$; á $\sigma \tau a \phi i s$ (a raisin) $=\sigma \tau \alpha \phi i ́ s$; aैбтахй (an ear of

 $\pi a ́ \lambda a \xi$ (a mole) $=\sigma \pi a ́ \lambda a \xi$; á $\sigma \phi \dot{\rho} \rho a \gamma o s$ (the throat), beside



 bhrûs (eyebrow). In some cases one of the two consonants falls out after the prosthetic vowel, as in o'vo $\quad$ a, Ion. ovै $\nu o \mu a$ for ó $\gamma-$ $\nu о \mu a$, L. nomen for gnomen; ò $\lambda_{\iota} \sigma \theta a ́ \nu \omega$ for ó $\gamma \lambda \iota \sigma \theta a \nu \omega$, R. $\gamma \lambda \iota \tau$;
 (to flow); ó $\delta v \sigma \sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon v o c$ (hating), R. óduc for ó óFıs, beside Skr. dvish (to hate). We have $\varepsilon$ èv $v \underset{a}{a}$ beside L. novem; ảvńp be-

 side E. mow ; è $\lambda a \chi$ ús beside Skr. laghu; "O ${ }^{\prime} \nu \mu \pi o s$ from R. $\lambda a \mu \pi$; غ̀ $\lambda a v ́ \nu \omega$ from R. $\lambda a$; ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\rho} \varepsilon \beta$ Jos beside Skr. rag'as (darkness) ; è $\varrho \varepsilon \tau \mu o ́ s ~ b e s i d e ~ L . ~ r e m u s ~ ; ~ e ̀ \rho v \theta \rho o ́ s ~ b e s i d e ~ L . ~ r u b e r ; ~$
 = F $\varepsilon^{\prime} \rho \sigma \eta$ (dew). We have in the case of the explosives, ódoús

 The opinion that these prosthetic vowels are fragments of prepositions does not appear to rest on any sufficient ground, for the apokope of dissyllabic prepositions is limited to the Æolic and Epic dialect, and the preposition $\varepsilon v \nu$ never loses its. final consonant.* Another explanation has been suggested to account for the vowels prefixed to $\lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho, \varsigma$. It is this, that, as we pronounce $l, e l, m, e m, \& c$. , so these letters were predisposed to the adoption of prosthetic vowels. In a similar way it is possible to account for the origin of $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \varepsilon \mu$ ósıs,
 supposing them to have passed through the stages $\dot{a}^{\epsilon} \nu \varepsilon \mu o \varepsilon \iota \varsigma$,
 gencies of the metre. We find in $\mathbb{E}$ olic the form $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \delta 0 \nu \tau \varepsilon c$ for ódóvres, $\dagger$ and consequently some writers derive óooús from the

[^28]R. $£ \delta($ to eat) ; but this is extremely unlikely, as the initial vowel does not appear in any of the sister languages. It is much more probable that o is a prosthetic vowel, as we find $\dot{a} \delta a \gamma \mu o{ }^{\prime}$ (a sting), $\mathfrak{a} \delta a \xi \neq \omega$ and ó óá $\xi_{\omega}$ (I bite, sting), beside סáкv $\omega$. 'Oфрús has been treated by some as equivalent to $\dot{o} \phi+\phi \rho v \rho=e y e+b r o w$, $\dot{o} \phi$ appearing in $\dot{o} \phi-\theta a \lambda \mu o ́ s$. The initial vowels in ó $\mu \phi a \lambda o ́ s$ and ${ }^{\circ} \nu \nu \boldsymbol{\xi}$ are not prosthetic, for the corresponding Latin terms are umbilicus and unguis, and the Latin language is notinclined to prosthesis. From a comparison of the Skr. nâbhi (navel) and nakha (a nail), it is likely that the original forms of the corresponding roots were nâbh and nagh, from which in GræcoItalic times were developed the roots $\hat{a} n b h$ and angh. Prosthetic vowels are of common occurrence in the Romance languages. Thus we have in French, épée for espée, from L. spada, échelle for eschelle, from L. scala, établir for establir, from L. stabilire, espérer from L. sperare, escabeau from L. scabellum estame from L. stamen ; in Spanish, estar = L. stare ; in Italian, aringa from G. ring, whence E. harangue. This tendency of the Romance languages to prefix initial vowels appears to have already begun in the fourth century, for on inscriptions of that date we find such forms as istatuam, ispirito, Isticho $=$ Sticho. In Welsh, $y$ is prefixed to words borrowed from the Latin which begin with $s$ followed by another consonant, as in ysgol, yspryd, ysgwyd from L. schola, spiritus, scutum.

§. 52. The insertion* of a vowel is of frequent occurrence in Greek, and is called ávámтv $\begin{aligned} & \text { ıs. }\end{aligned}$. This insertion occurs before or after $\lambda, \rho$, and the nasals, and, according to Curtius, arises from the tone, perceptibly heard in these sonants, upon which fact also rest the frequent metathesis of these sounds, and the possibility of $r$ and $l$ being treated as vowels in some languages. The vowels that are inserted are generally $a$ and

* Consult Curtius, " Grundzüge," p. 656 ; and Walter, in "K. Z.," vol. x., p. 428 , seq., vol. xii. p. 375 , seq., p. 401 , seq., on Vocaleinschie" bung in Griechischen.
$\varepsilon$, less frequently $o$ and $\iota$, and very seldom $v$. We find a vowel inserted before or after $\lambda$, in the following cases: $\dot{\omega} \lambda \varepsilon ́ v \eta$,

 ả $\rho \dot{\gamma} \gamma \omega$ beside á $\varrho \kappa \varepsilon \neq \omega$, ä $\lambda_{\kappa \eta}$, L. arceo, Skr. raksh (to protect);
 (long) ; ŋ̉ $\lambda a \kappa a ́ t \eta ~(s p i n d l e) ~ b e s i d e ~ a ̈ \rho к v s ~(a ~ n e t) ; ~ \eta ้ \lambda \nu ~ Ә о \nu=~$ $\tilde{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$ (?) ; $\theta a ́ \lambda a \sigma \sigma a$ for $\tau a \rho a \chi y a$ from R. $\tau \rho a \chi$ (according to Walter, however, for $\theta \lambda a \tau$-ya, connected with L. fret-um); ко入єкávos (long and thin), ко入oббós (a great statue), O. L. cracentes (graciles), L. gracilis; $\mu$ ó $\nu \boldsymbol{\beta} \delta$ os, L. plumbum ; $\mu a \lambda a-$
 (to strike), not connected with $\pi \lambda a ́ \xi$ (a plain), as $\pi \varepsilon ́ \lambda a \gamma o s$ denotes the sea in its dangerous aspect; $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \theta \rho o \nu=\pi \lambda \varepsilon \theta \rho o \nu$. In the case of $\rho$ we have the following examples : $\tau a \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega=$
 $\gamma v \iota a=$ ỏ $\rho \gamma v \iota a ́$ ó $\rho \iota \gamma \nu a ́ o \mu a \iota\left(\mathrm{I}\right.$ stretch), R. ó $\rho \gamma$, Skr. $\arg ^{\prime}$ (to acquire), L. rego; Жol. $\phi \in \rho \in \varepsilon \nu a=\phi \varepsilon \rho \nu \eta ́ ; ~ \varepsilon ̇ \rho \omega \delta \iota o ́ s ~(a ~ h e r o n) ~$



 shoes); тарıұєv́ш (I embalm), тápıұos (a mummy, dried or salted fish), beside $\tau a \rho \chi{ }^{v} \omega$ (I bury solemnly), perhaps connected with R. $\tau$ eps (to dry), Skr. tarsh (to thirst), L. torreo for tors-eo. In the case of the nasals we have as examples, кovis, pl. кovídsc (eggs of lice, nits), from R. knid, as appears from A. S. hnit, Lith. glìndas, L. lendes; oै ov $\xi$, Sl. ỏvv from R.angh; $\pi \iota \nu v \tau o ́ s$.(wise) from R. $\pi \nu v$, whence $\pi \nu \varepsilon ́ \omega, \pi \varepsilon \pi \nu v \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s$;
 (a slice), beside $\tau \mu \eta$ $\gamma \omega(\mathrm{I}$ cut), from R. $\tau \mu a \gamma(?)$; Tó $\mu a \rho о \varsigma=\mathrm{T} \mu \tilde{a}-$ $\rho o s$ (a mountain in Thesprotia) ; T $v \mu \tilde{\omega} \lambda o s=T \mu \tilde{\omega} \lambda o s$ (a mountain in Lydia). In other languages also we find vowels similarly inserted. Thus, in Zend $e$ is in certain cases inserted between two consonants ; and $r$ when followed by a consonant, or when
final, becomes re, as dademahi (we give) $=$ Skr. dadmasi, da-
 sing.) from St. dâtar. In O. H. G. we have puruc = Goth. baurgs, farah $=$ L. porcus, araweiz $=$ L. ervum. In Latin, we have A'sculapius = 'Абк $\eta \eta \pi$ เós, Procina $=$ Прóкv $\eta$, Alcumena $={ }^{\prime} A \lambda \kappa \mu \eta \nu \eta$, sumus from esumus = I. E. asmas. In Oscan a vowel is frequently inserted, as Alafaternom = L. Alfaternorum, aragetud $=\mathrm{L}$. argento, sakarater $=\mathrm{L}$. sacratur.


## §. 53. The Gutturals.

$\mathrm{K}=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . k: \kappa a \lambda o ́ s, \kappa a \lambda \lambda \hat{\nu} \nu \omega$ (I make clean), Skr. kalya (healthy), E. heal, hale; кápvò (a nut), Skr. karaka (cocoa nut), L. carina (a shell, keel) ; каркivos (a crab), Skr. karka (a crab), L. cancer ; кєíl $\omega$, кє́a $\xi_{\omega} \omega$, R. $\sigma \kappa \varepsilon$ or $\sigma \kappa a$, Skr. k'hâ (to divide), L. descisco, scio; גúкos = Skr. vṛkas (a wolf); סعíк$\nu v \mu \iota$, R. $\delta \iota \kappa$, Skr. dis (to show), L. dico; סє́кa = Skr. and Z. das'an (ten), L. decem; '̇катоv for èv-катоv, Skr. s'atam (an hundred), L. centum.
 Skr. gar (to awake) ; $\sigma$ т́́ $\gamma \omega$, Skr. sthag (to cover), L. tego; á $\rho_{\rho o ́ s ~=~ S k r . ~ a g ' r a s ~(a ~ l e v e l ~ p l a i n), ~ L . ~ a g e r ~ ; ~ a ́ p \gamma \eta ́ s ~(b r i g h t), ~}^{\text {a }}$ á $\rho \gamma v \rho o s$, ä $\rho \gamma \bar{i} \lambda o s$ (white clay), Skr. arg'una (bright), rag'ata (silver), L. arguo (I make clear), argentum. $\Gamma$ is found for
 $\tau \dot{\jmath} \kappa \omega$; $\mu i \sigma \gamma \omega$, R. $\mu \iota \gamma$, beside Skr. mis'ra (mixed), L. misceo ;
 $\pi \eta \prime \gamma \nu v \mu$, beside L. pac-iscor, Skr. pas' (to bind) ; $\ddot{\varrho} \rho \pi a \xi$, St. $\dot{a} \rho \pi a \gamma=$ L. rapax, St. rapac ; кৎаvү́n, beside Skr. krôs'a (a cry) ; ह̀ $\phi \rho a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$ beside $\phi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega=\phi \rho a \kappa-ј \omega=$ L. farcio; $\mu a \gamma \varepsilon u ́ s$ (one who kneads) beside $\mu a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega=\mu a \kappa y \omega$, L. macerare ; $\pi \lambda \eta \gamma \dot{\eta}$ beside $\pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega=\pi \lambda \eta \kappa y \omega$, Lith. plàkti (to beat). We find a tenuis weakened to a media in It. luogo, from L. locum, It. padre from L. patrem, Fr. abeille from L. apiculam, \&c. $\Gamma$ is lost in aĩ $=$ रala, ő $\rho o s=$ Skr. giri (a mountain), Bœot. i $\omega$ v
$=\varepsilon^{\varepsilon} \gamma \dot{\omega} \nu$, Tarentine $\dot{i} \lambda i ́ o s=o j \lambda i ́ \gamma o s, ~ \Phi \iota a \lambda i ́ a=\Phi \iota \gamma a \lambda i ́ a$ (an Arcadian city). In the following cases, in which $\gamma$ corresponds to a Sanskrit $h$ or $g h$, either each root existed in two forms, one with $g$, and another with $g h$, in the Indo-European, or else the I. E. form had $g$ only, from which by aspiration $g h$ was developed in Sanskrit, and this $g h$ became $h: \gamma^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} v} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{S}=$ Skr. hanus (the chin), L. gena, Goth. kinnus ; $\gamma \varepsilon$, Skr. ha, Ved. gha, Goth. $k$ in mi-k, O. H. G. $h$ in unsi- $h$; $\mu \varepsilon ́ \gamma a \varsigma, ~ \mu \varepsilon \gamma a ́ \lambda o c ~$ $=$ Goth. mikils, Skr. mahat (great), L. magnus ; छ̇ $\gamma \dot{\omega} \nu=$ Skr. aham, Goth. $i k$. In these cases the Gothic $k$ points back to an I. E. $g$. In the following examples $\gamma=$ I. E. $g h$; ह̇ $\gamma \gamma{ }^{\prime}{ }_{c}$, Skr. anhu (narrow), Goth. aggous (narrow), the original gh being still retained in ả $\gamma \chi \iota$; $\theta$ v $\gamma$ át $\eta \rho=$ Skr. duhitâ ; and perhaps in $\lambda a \gamma \omega$ ćs (a hare) beside Skr. lañgh (to jump).
$\mathrm{X}=\mathrm{I}$. E. gh: סo入ıұós $=$ Skr. dîrghas (long) ; è $\lambda a \chi$ ús $=$ Skr. laghus (light); $\sigma \tau \varepsilon i \chi \omega$, Skr. stigh (to ascend), Goth. steiga (I go up) ; ұ $\rho i \omega$, х $\rho i ̈ \sigma \mu a$, Skr. ghar (to sprinkle), gharsh (to rub), ghrta (clarified butter); $\chi$ oĭpos, Skr. ghrshti (a pig), O. N. grîs (a little pig). $\mathbf{X}, \theta$, and $\phi$, frequently represent an I. E. $k, t$, and $p$, as we shall see in $\S .63$, on Aspiration.

The spiritus asper represents a Græco-Italic initial $y, v$, and $s$. It is =y in $\eta \pi \pi a \rho$, Skr. yakrt, L. jecur ; $\check{\omega} \rho a$, Z. yâre (a year), E. year ; ös = Skr. yas (who). It is = $v^{*}$ in ${ }^{\prime \prime} \sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho o s$, L. vesper ; ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \nu \nu v \mu \iota=\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon} \sigma-\nu v \mu \iota$, Skr. vas (to clothe). It is $=s$ in $\dot{\delta}, \dot{\eta},=$ Skr. sa (he), sâ (she), O. L. acc. sum, sam ; $\dot{a}$ in ${ }_{a}^{\prime \prime}-\pi a \xi$ $=s a$ in Skr. sa-krt (once), L. simplex ; $\dot{\varepsilon}=$ L. se ; $\rho \varepsilon \epsilon$, R. $\rho \cup$ for $\sigma \rho v$, Skr. sru (to flow) ; $\rho \circ \phi \varepsilon ́ \omega$, L. sorbeo. In $\varepsilon i \pi o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ (for $\begin{gathered}\sigma \\ \varepsilon\end{gathered}$
 aspirate perhaps arose from the $\sigma$ lost in the second syllable. Sometimes the original initial $\sigma$ is retained beside the younger aspirate, as in $\sigma \tilde{v}_{S}=\tilde{v} \varsigma,{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \lambda \lambda o i=\Sigma \varepsilon \lambda \lambda o i$. . The spiritus asper

[^29]is preserved between two vowels in $\tau a \tilde{\omega} s=$ L．pavo，and in
 nose），the sp．asp．represents $g h$ ．In Attic an initial sp．asp． is frequently added where it does not exist in the other dialects．Hence the Athenians were called $\delta a \sigma u v \tau \iota \kappa o i t ~ i n ~ o p-~$ position to the Eolians，who were called $\psi \iota \lambda \omega \tau \iota \kappa o i$, from their aversion to this sound．Thus we have imaos beside Lesb．
 forms $\Lambda \varepsilon v ́ \kappa \iota \pi \pi o \varsigma, ~ Г \lambda a v ́ \kappa \iota \pi \pi o \varsigma, ~ L . ~ e q u u s ~=~ S k r . ~ a s ' v a s: ~ \eta ̈ \lambda \iota o s ~$


 Initial $v$ in Attic always is aspirated，as in $\boldsymbol{v} \pi \delta^{\prime}$ ，Skr．upa（near）； $\dot{v} \pi \varepsilon \rho$, Skr．upari（above）；v̋ $\delta \omega \rho$ ，Skr．udan（water）；v̌ $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho o s$ $=$ Skr．uttaras（later）．Similarly we find $h$ prefixed in L．hu－ merus for umerus，humor for umor，Span．hedrar $=$ L．iterare， Fr．haut＝L．altus．

The spiritus asper was frequently changed into the lenis，
 and ovious beside íסós，R．s $\mathfrak{\varepsilon \delta}=$ Skr．sad（to go）；aै $\omega$（I sa－ tiate）only found in inf．pres．ä $\mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$ and ${ }^{\prime} \delta \delta \delta \eta \nu$ beside $\check{\iota} \delta \eta \nu$ ， and L．satis，satur ；＇E $\rho \iota \nu \nu v ́ s ~=~ S k r . ~ S a r a n y u ̂ s ~ ; ~ \varepsilon \ell ้ \rho \omega ~(I ~ j o i n), ~$ beside $\sigma \varepsilon \varrho \varrho a ́$, ő $\rho \mu$ оऽ，and L．sero ；غ̇тєós＝Skr．satyas（true）； òтós beside L．sucus；ỏpós beside L．servm ；ả（in ä入oхos $\& c$ ．），for $\dot{a}=$ Skr．sa； $\boldsymbol{\eta} \theta \omega=\sigma \dot{\eta} \theta \omega$（I sift）；idí $\omega$（I sweat）； beside íopús；íoıos beside $\dot{\varepsilon}=\sigma \mathrm{F} \varepsilon$ ；oै $\phi \rho a$ from pronominal stem $\delta=$ Skr．$y a$ ．In Ionic we also see a tendency to weaken the spiritus asper in the fact that after elision a preceding te－ nuis was not aspirated by a following aspirate，as in $\dot{a} \boldsymbol{\pi}^{\prime}$ o $\tilde{v}^{\prime}$ ， кároঠos．In Æolic the initial aspirate was kept，according to Ahrens，whenever it represented an original $s$ or $y$ ，except in ${ }^{v} \mu \mu \varepsilon \varsigma$ beside Skr．yushman，and катьס＠úбєє beside L．sedeo， Goth．sita（I sit），but it was lost whenever it had arisen from any other cause．Thus we find the aspirate kept in üyvos beside Skr．$y a g^{\prime}$（venerari），ó ós in $\begin{gathered}\text { ぞ } \phi o \delta o s ~ b e s i d e ~ S k r . ~ s a d ~(t o ~\end{gathered}$
go), \&c. ; and it is absent in ä $\mu \mu \varepsilon s$ beside $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon$ ins $_{s}$ and Skr.
 of the case does not appear to be exactly correct; for we find in Alkæus ка $\theta \dot{v} \pi \varepsilon \rho \theta \varepsilon \nu, \pi \rho \dot{\prime} \dot{\tau} \iota \sigma \theta^{\prime} \dot{v} \pi \delta^{\prime}$, where the aspiration before $v$ is retained, though it is not original, as we see from the Skr. forms upari and upa; and moreover in $\tilde{\tilde{z}} \delta v \boldsymbol{s}=$ Skr. sva-
 is lost, though the words originally began with $s v$. This tendency of the Æolic to $\psi i \lambda \omega \sigma \iota \varsigma$ refutes the old-fashioned idea that Latin was closely connected with it, for the sibilant is retained in Latin, from which the aspiration in Greek was developed. The spiritus asper is entirely lost in Modern Greek.

## §. 54. The Dentals.

$\mathrm{T}=\mathrm{I}$. E. $t: \dot{a}^{\nu} \tau \dot{\prime}$, Skr. anti (before) ; $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \mu a t$, R. $\pi \varepsilon \tau$, Skr. pat (to fly) ; $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \nu \omega$, R. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \nu$, Skr. stan (to groan) ; $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho-$ $\nu v \mu$. Skr. star (to strew) ; $\tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$, R. $\tau \varepsilon \nu$ or $\tau a \nu$, Skr. tan (to stretch) ; \&c.
$\mathrm{T}=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . k v: \tau i \varsigma=\mathrm{L} . q u i s=$ Osc. pis, Skr. kim (quid), Z. $k^{\prime} i s k^{\prime} a$ (quisquis), Osc. pitpit $=$ L. quidquid $; \tau^{\prime}=$ L. que, Skr. $k^{\prime} a$, Goth. $h$ in nih $=$ L. neque; $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \tau \varepsilon=$ L. quinque, Æol. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \mu-$ $\pi \varepsilon ;$ aै $\lambda \lambda о \tau \varepsilon=$ Dor. aै入入ока; $\tau а \omega ̆ \varsigma=$ L. pavo. T appears to correspond to $k$ in $\tau i \omega$ (I honour), $i i \nu \omega$ (I punish), Skr. $k$ ' $i$ (to distribute), Z. $k^{\prime} i$ (to punish), and in ákıvaүнós $=\tau i v a \gamma-$ $\mu \circ s$ (кivnoıs). Here $k$ became $t$, through the stages $k y$ and $t y$. In Latin, $c$ and $t$ are frequently interchanged before $i$ as in patricius $=$ patritius, Mucius $=$ Mutius .
$\Delta=$ I. E. $d: \delta a \mu a ́ \omega$, R. $\delta a \mu$, Skr. dam (to tame), L. do-

 eat), L. edo, Goth. ita (I eat) ; ह̈ఢopal, R. £́ס, Skr. sad (to sit), L. sedeo, Goth. sita (I sit) ; \&c.
$\Delta=\mathrm{I}$. E. $t$ : סátıs (a carpet), beside $\tau a ́ \pi \eta s$ and $\tau a \pi i ́ s ;$



 side L. nepotes.
$\Delta=\mathrm{I}$. E. $d h$ in $\pi \dot{v} \nu \delta \alpha \xi \xi$ (the bottom) beside $\pi v \theta \mu \eta \dot{\eta}$, Skr. budhna (the bottom), I. E. bhudh being the root; and perhaps in ád $\delta a i v \omega$ (I increase) beside $\dot{a} \lambda \theta a i v \omega$ (I heal) and Skr. ardh (to increase).
$\Delta=$ I. E. $g$ : $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \lambda_{\text {ós }}$ (the womb) $=$ Skr. garbhas (the
 Conversely we find $\gamma \lambda u \kappa u ́ s$ for $\delta \lambda \nu \kappa v$, , L. dulcis, and $\gamma v o ́ p o s$ for and beside $\delta \nu o ́ \phi o s$. We also find $\delta$ for $\beta$ in Dor. öde $\lambda$ ós

$\theta=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . d h:$ ǎ $\nu \theta_{\mathrm{os}}$, Skr. andlas (plant), L. ador; $\theta \tilde{\eta} \sigma \theta a u$ (Hom. to milk), $\theta \tilde{\eta} \lambda \nu \mathrm{c}, \mathrm{R} . \theta a, \theta \eta$, Skr. $d h \hat{a}$ (to drink), dhênu (a cow), L. filius, femina, felare (to suck) ; $\theta \rho a \sigma$ ט́s, Skr. dharsh (to dare), Goth. ga-daursan ( $\theta a \dot{\rho} \rho \varepsilon i ̄)$ ) ; $\theta$ v ár $\eta \rho$, I. E. dhughatar, Skr. duhitar, Goth. dauhtar; 0úpa, Skr. dhwâra (door) L. fores, Goth. dour (door); \&c.
$\theta=$ I. E. gh in $\theta \varepsilon \rho \rho \mu \sigma_{\rho}$, R. $\theta \varepsilon \rho$, Skr. gharma (heat), L. formus (hot), fornax, forceps, Goth. varmjan ( $\theta$ á $\lambda \pi \varepsilon \iota \nu$ ). We find $\theta$ and $\chi$ interchanged in ö $\rho v i \theta$ os $=$ Bœot. ő $\rho v i \chi o s$, Mod.
 be derived from ê $\rho \chi \circ \mu a l$. This change is not easily accounted for: it has been suggested that $\theta$ developed a hard aspirate after it, before which it afterwards fell out, and that this aspirate afterwards developed $\chi$ before it, and then fell out. This explanation is, however, very improbable. We also find $\theta$ interchanged with $\phi$ in Kret. ö $\theta \rho \underline{\rho}$ s (a mountain) $=$ ó $\phi \rho v_{s}$

 $=\phi u ́ \lambda \lambda a$; and perhaps in $\theta u \lambda \lambda i ́ s, \theta a \lambda \lambda i ́ s, ~ \theta u ́ \lambda a k o s, ~ a l l ~ m e a n-~$ ing a bag, if these words are connected with Goth. balgs (a bag).

oúpavós $=$ Skr．Varunas（the god of the water）；ő $\rho o s, S k r$ ． giri（a mountain），Ch．Sl．gora（a mountain）；ó $\rho \nu v \mu \iota, ~ R . ~ o ́ \rho$ ， Skr．ar（to move），L．orior ；$\rho \varepsilon \omega$, R．$\rho v, \sigma \rho v$, Skr．sru（to flow）； $\sigma \bar{v} \rho \iota \gamma \xi$, Skr．svar（to sound），\＆c．

P is lost in $\pi о \tau i=\pi \rho о \tau i, \pi \rho o ́ s . ~ \Pi \varrho о \tau i ́$ became $\pi о \rho \tau i$, which is found in the Kretan dialect，and then moti：similarly we
 L．pedo $=\pi\{\varrho \delta \omega$ ，\＆c．Leo Meyer asserts that $\rho$ is lost in $\pi \varepsilon \tau a ́ \nu \nu v \mu \iota$ beside Skr．prath（to extend），and фє́ $\gamma \gamma^{\circ}$ os besideSkr． $b h r \hat{a} g^{\prime}($ to shine）：but $\pi \varepsilon \tau a ́ \nu \nu v \mu \iota$ is connected with L．pateo， pando，O．H．G．fadam（filum），E．fathom，and prath is found in $\pi \lambda a \tau v ́ s ; b h r a ̂ g^{\prime}$ is connected with $\phi \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ ，L．fulgeo，flagro， Goth．bairhts（ $\delta \tilde{\eta} \lambda o s$ ），and，according to Curtius，фध́ $\gamma \gamma o s$（for $\phi \varepsilon \gamma \gamma \mathrm{Fos}_{\text {）}}$ ）is related to $\phi$ áFos（※ol．фaṽos，Pamphyl．фáßos）， exactly as $\beta \not{ }^{\ell} \nu$ Oos is to $\beta$ á ${ }^{2}$ os．

The Laconians frequently changed $\sigma$ ，especially when final，

 $\gamma \dot{\eta} \omega s$ ，\＆c．The only other example of the same change in
 This change is also found in a few cases in the Æolic dialects of Elis and Eretria．In no case does $\sigma$ appear to have been changed into $\rho$ ，when it comes between two vowels：thus we


Initial $\rho$ is always aspirated，except in＇Pápıov $\pi \varepsilon \delta i o v$ and pápos（a child untimely born）．
$\Lambda=$ I．E．$r: \ddot{a} \lambda \lambda_{0} \mu a \iota$, R．$\dot{a} \lambda$, Skr．sar（to go）；ä $\lambda_{s}$ ，Skr． sara（salt）；$\beta$ oú $\lambda o \mu a \iota, ~ S k r . ~ a n d ~ Z . ~ v a r ~(t o ~ c h o o s e) ~ ; ~ 厄 ̈ \lambda o s ~$ $=$ Skr．sarvas（all），O．L．sollus（all），\＆c．

$$
\Lambda=\text { I. E. } l: \text { see } \S .21 .
$$

$\Lambda$ represents an older $\nu$ in $\lambda i ́ t \rho o \nu$ beside $\nu i ́ \tau \rho o \nu$ ，from Heb． neter ；$\pi \lambda \varepsilon \dot{v} \mu \omega \nu$ beside $\pi \nu \varepsilon \dot{\jmath} \mu \omega \nu$ ；$\sigma \kappa \lambda о$ óтa $\xi$（a large bird，of snipe kind），beside G．schnepfe，E．snipe ；and perhaps in ä入入os $=$ Skr．anyas（alius）．Conversely the Dorians often changed $\lambda$ before $\tau$ and $\theta$ into $\nu$ ，as in $\beta \varepsilon \varepsilon_{\tau \tau \iota \sigma t o s, ~ \phi i ́ v t a t o s, ~}^{\eta} \nu \theta \varepsilon \nu, \& c$ ．

We find $n$ and $l$ interchanged in other languages, as in Skr. skandha (shoulder), Med. L. spalda, E. shoulder ; Skr. kanyâ (a girl), Ir. caile (a woman) ; kovííes (eggs of lice, nits), L. lendes, Lith. glindas ; It. Bologna $=$ Bononia, veleno $=$ L. venenum ; Prov. namela (a blade) $=\mathrm{L}$. lamella.
 ä $\lambda_{\mu \eta}, \dot{a} \lambda^{\gamma} \gamma \check{\mathrm{E}} \nu$, \&c., as in E. talk, calm, and Umbr. muta, vutu for multa, vultum.
 am), है $\sigma \tau i=$ Skr. asti (he is), L. sum, est, Lith. esmi, esti, Goth.
 clothe), L. vestis; R. ท̀s, ท̃ $\sigma \tau a \iota=$ Skr. âstê ; ťvos, Skr. vishu (æque); R. $\sigma v, \kappa a \sigma \sigma i ́ \omega$ (from kađá and $\sigma v ́ \omega$ ), Skr. siv (to sow), L. suo, Goth. siu-ja (żп! $\rho \rho ̣ a ́ \pi \tau \omega)$.
$\mathbf{\Sigma}$ is generally omitted between two vowels, as in $\mu^{\dot{\varepsilon}} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ous for $\mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \sigma \circ=$ Skr. manasas (gen. sing.) ; $\phi \underline{\varrho} \rho \eta$ for $\phi \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \sigma a l$; Fiós (poison), = Skr. and Z. vishas (poison), L. virus; \&c. $\mathbf{\Sigma}$ in these cases probably first became the spiritus asper, and then fell out. $\Sigma$ is, however, frequently retained, especially when it represents an original $t$, as in $\phi \eta \sigma^{\prime}$, Dor. фarí; द̇veaú-
 from $\pi \lambda$ дoüros ; $\pi \lambda \eta$ ơoos beside ä́ $\pi \lambda \eta$ ros, Dor. $\pi \lambda$ arios ; סıaкó-
 $\tau l$, Skr. parut ; $\epsilon_{\pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \nu}$, Dor. $\xi_{i \pi \varepsilon \tau o \nu}$, from $\pi i \pi \tau \omega=\pi \iota-\pi \varepsilon \tau \omega$;


The Laconians generally changed $\theta$ into $\sigma$ : in the Lysistrata of Aristophanes we find such forms as $\sigma \varepsilon \in \varepsilon \varepsilon$, $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \omega, \mathfrak{a} \gamma a-$ oós, $\sigma$ oós ( $\theta$ Eós ), 'A Aáva, \&e., and yet in other cases, without any apparent reason, $\theta$ is retained, as in $\theta$ zík\& $\lambda o l$, \&c.; in Thucydides, in the Lakonian decree (v. 77), we find $\tau \bar{\omega} \sigma \omega \bar{\omega}$ б́́patog for той $\theta$ єoũ $\theta$ v́raatos, \&c. In every case they used $\sigma$ for $\theta$, except where the law of euphony would be violated by the change; as in $\theta$ íacos, on account of the following $\sigma$;
 conjunction of $\sigma \rho, \& c$. This change did not set in till late;
for we find that it was unknown to the Spartan Colonists who founded Tarentum and Heraklea. The Dorians once possessed another sibilant, which they called San, and of which traces are found in the double $\sigma$ in such Dorian forms as 'Apıoбтo'$\delta а \mu о с$.
$\mathrm{N}=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . n: \mathrm{R} .{ }_{a}{ }^{\nu} \nu,{ }_{a} \nu \varepsilon \mu \circ \mathrm{~s}$, Skr. an (to breathe), anila (wind), L. animus, anus ; ảvи́p, Skr. nara (a man), Sabin. nero (brave) ; ধ̇v $\nu^{\prime} a$, Skr. and Z. navan (nine); R. $\mu \varepsilon \nu, \mu a \nu, \mu \varepsilon ́ v o s$, $\mu \tilde{\eta} \nu \iota$, Mév $\tau \omega \rho, \mu \nu \eta \dot{\eta} \eta$, Skr. and Z. man (to think), L. maneo, memini, moneo, Goth. muns (vónua), O. H. G. minna (love); $\nu a \tilde{v} s=$ Skr. nâus $($ a ship $)$; L. navis, \&c.
 dâm, L. pedum ; غ̇ф̣́́єтоv = abharatam ; тóv = Skr. tam, L. istum ; $\tau a ́ \omega \nu(\tau \tilde{\omega} \nu)=$ Skr. tâsâm, L. istarum ; and similar terminations. Curtius also compares $\dot{\eta} \boldsymbol{v}_{i} a$ (the reins), with Skr. yam (to bind); R. $\theta a \nu$, 衾 $\theta a v o \nu$, with Skr. dham (to blow) ; $\beta a i ́ \nu \omega=\beta a \nu-\mathrm{y} \omega$, with Skr. gam; кv́avos (dark blue steel),
 with Skr. him (frost), hima (snow), L. hiems. These are, however, doubtful cases; and it is quite possible that $\nu$ may have originally been part of the pronominal suffix na, as is certainly the case with $\beta a i \nu \omega$, the root of which is $\beta a=$ Skr. $g \hat{a}$ (to go).

## §. 55. The Labials.

$\Pi=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . p:$ ànó, Skr. apa (away) Z. apa (from) L. $a b$; غ̇mi, Skr. api (to), Z. aipi (after) ; £̇ $\pi \tau a ́=$ Skr. saptan, Z. haptan ; R. $\lambda_{i \pi}, \lambda_{i \pi}{ }^{\prime}$ (oil), Skr. lip (to anoint), \&c.

Whenever $\pi$ corresponds to a Skr. $k, k^{\prime}, s^{\prime}$, either the original sound must have been $k v$, or, if $k$ was the original sound, it must have passed through the stage $k v$ in becoming $\pi$. Thus we have $i \pi \pi o s=$ Skr. as'vas, L. equus, O. S. ehu; R. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi$, $\varepsilon$ ह́ro$\mu a \iota$, Skr. sak' (to follow), L. sequor; R. $\lambda_{\iota} \pi, \lambda_{\varepsilon} i \pi \omega$, Skr. rik' (to leave), L. linquo ; $\pi \varepsilon \nu \tau \varepsilon$, Skr. pañk'an, L. quinque ; R. $\pi \varepsilon \pi$, $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \omega$, Skr. pak' (to cook), L. coquo ; $\pi \boldsymbol{o}$

Skr. ka (who), kva (where), L. quis, Goth. hvas (who); in all which cases the I. E. forms had $k v$, where the Greek has $\pi$. $\Sigma \pi$ and $\sigma_{k}$ are interchanged in some cases; thus we have $\sigma \pi a ́ \lambda a \xi($ a mole $)=\sigma \kappa a ́ \lambda о \psi, \sigma \pi a ́ \lambda a \theta \rho o \nu($ a poker $)=\sigma \kappa a ́ \lambda \varepsilon \nu \theta \rho o v ;$ similarly we have $\sigma \pi \iota \nu \theta \dot{\eta} \rho$ beside L. scintilla, Goth. skeinan ; $\sigma к \bar{\lambda} \lambda о \nu$, L. spolia; R. $\sigma \kappa є \pi, ~ \sigma к$ ќnтоцає, L. specio ; R. $\sigma ф а \lambda$, $\sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$; Skr. sphal and skhal (to totter). $\Sigma \pi$ and $\sigma \tau$ are also interchanged : $\sigma \tau a ́ \delta ̊ \iota \nu, ~ Æ o l . ~ \sigma \pi a ́ d ı o v, ~ L . ~ s p a t i u m ; ~ Æ o l . ~ \sigma \pi o ́ \lambda a ~$ for $\sigma \tau 0 \lambda \eta$; similarly we have $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon ́ \delta \omega$ beside L. studeo and $\sigma \tau \rho o u ̈ \theta o s$ beside Goth. sparva, E. sparrow.
$\Pi$ appears to represent an I. E. $6 h$ in the two following cases: R. $\pi \iota, \pi \omega, \pi i \nu \omega$, Æol. $\pi \dot{\omega} \nu \omega$, Skr. pĥ, pâ, pibâmi (I drink), where we find a trace of the I. E. $b h$ in $b$, L. potus, $b i b o$, E. beer; $\pi v o ́ s$ (beestings), Skr. piyusha (beestings), O. H. G. biost, N. H. G. biest, E. beestings.

B $=$ I. E. $b$ : see §. 22 .
 $\theta$ áu $\mu$ os which is related to Hom. đá $\phi$ os as $\beta \hat{\varepsilon} \nu \theta$ os to $\beta$ átos; $\phi \xi$ ßouat for $\phi \varepsilon \beta \iota o \mu a t$, a reduplication of R. $\phi \iota=$ Skr. $b h \hat{\imath}, b i-$ bhêmi (I fear) ; $\beta_{\rho \varepsilon \chi \mu o^{\prime} \text { (the top of the head), A. S. bregen }}$
 $=$ Goth. bairga (R. barg), just as Goth. hvairnei (the skull), is derived from a root signifying to cover; $\beta \rho \in \mu \omega$, Skr. bhram (to whirl), ${ }^{*}$ L. fremo, O. N. brim (the surge), фópucy $\xi^{\xi}$ may be derived from this root, as $\beta_{\rho} \ell \mu \varepsilon \sigma \theta a t$ is used of the lyre in Pindar (Nem. xi. 7); $\theta \rho o ́ \mu \beta$ ßos (a clot of blood), beside $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\rho} \neq \phi \omega$

 (a cup) $=$ Skr. kumbhas (a jug) ; ${ }^{\circ} \mu \beta \rho$ os beside Skr. ambhas
 фos, Skr. stambh (to prop); $\sigma$ гоó $\mu$ ßos (a whirlwind, a top), beside $\sigma \tau \rho \notin \phi \omega ; \beta \lambda v ́ \omega=\phi \lambda v ́ \omega$ (to bubble) ; $\lambda a \mu \beta a ́ \nu \omega$, R. $\lambda a \beta$,

[^30]beside $\varepsilon \neq-\lambda_{\eta \phi-\alpha}$, Skr. labh (to seize). In addition to these examples, Grassman ("K. Z.," vol. xii., pp. 91, 93), adduces ö $\beta_{\rho \iota \mu о я ~ b e s i d e ~ S k r . ~ a m b h r n a ~(p o w e r f u l), ~ \beta a \sigma к а i ́ \nu \omega ~ b e s i d e ~ L . ~}^{\text {L }}$ fascino, and $\beta a^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ (I speak), beside $\phi \eta \not \mu \eta$, R. $\phi \eta$, Skr. bhâ, but ${ }^{\circ} \beta \rho \iota \mu$ s is rather connected with R . $\beta \rho \iota, \beta \rho i \theta \omega$, and the other two cases are extremely doubtful.

B = I. E. v: ßoúdoual, Skr. var (to choose), L. volo; $\beta \lambda$ áбтๆ (a shoot), Skr. vardh (to grow). Similarly we find
 however, $\beta$ may have been pronounced as $F$.
$\mathrm{B}=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . p: \dot{a} \beta$ @ós (luxurious), beside á a $\pi a \lambda$ ós (tender), perhaps connected with L. sapor: 'A $\mu$ § aкía beside the older 'A $\mu \pi \rho$ акía, $\pi$ becoming $\beta$ on account of the preceding $\mu$, just as in Modern Greek $\mu \pi$ is written for the sound of the old $\beta$;

 (the head), кußıбтáш (I jump headlong), beside Skr. kapâla
 $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \beta \dot{\omega} \varsigma$ (found on an inscription of Andania) $=\kappa \varepsilon \kappa \lambda о \phi \dot{\omega}$, from
 $\lambda o v$ (a clapper) beside L. crepare, owe their $\beta_{s}$ to the influence of $\mu ; \lambda_{\varepsilon}$ ß $\quad$ noís (a skin) and $\lambda_{o}$ ßós (a pod) beside $\lambda_{\varepsilon ́ \pi}^{\pi} \omega$; $\sigma$ rì $\beta \omega$ beside $\sigma \tau \iota \lambda \pi \nu$ ós (glittering), perhaps connected with $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho о \pi \eta$, ả $\sigma \tau \rho a^{\prime} \tau \tau \omega$; $\sigma \tau о \iota \beta \dot{\eta}$ (stuffing) beside $\sigma \tau v ́ \pi o \varsigma$, Skr.

 connected with L. pasco by Leo Meyer, but this comparison is very doubtful, as there are no analogous cases save the last-
 $\pi$ appears to represent an older $\beta$; but Curtius suggests that $\pi$ may be original, and that the root is not $\beta \lambda a \beta$, but $\beta \lambda a \pi$ for $\mu \lambda a \pi$, a causative formed from $\mu \lambda a=$ Skr. mlâ (to fade), which is the root of $\mu a \lambda a \kappa o ́ s, \beta \lambda{ }^{\prime} \xi$.

Whenever $\beta$ corresponds to a Skr. $g$ or $g^{\prime}$, either the original sound was $g v$, or, if $g$ was the original sound, it must
have passed through the stage $g v$ in becoming $\beta$. Thus we have R. $\beta a$, Skr. g $\hat{a}$ (to go), agâm $=\hat{\xi} \beta \eta \nu$, Lat. betere, venio, Osc. ben (to come), Goth. quiman (to come) ; R. $\beta a \lambda, \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, Skr. gal (to drop), O. H. G. quillu, (scaturio) ; $\beta$ a@ús = Skr. gurus $=$ Goth. kaurs ; $\beta i a$, Skr. g'i (to conquer) ; ßios, Skr. gîv (to live), L. viro, E. quick ; ßó, $\gamma$ óos, Skr. gu (to sound), L. boere, bovare; R. ßoo, ßooá, Skr. gar (to devour), L. vo-
 $=$ Kret. $\pi \rho \varepsilon і ̈ \gamma v \varsigma$, Dor. $\pi \rho \varepsilon ́ \sigma \gamma v$ s, from $\pi \rho \varepsilon \varsigma$ (L.pris in pris-cus, pristinus $)=\pi a ́ \rho o s=$ Skr. puras (before), and R. $\gamma v=\gamma a, \gamma \varepsilon \nu$, from which also comes $\Pi_{\varepsilon} \lambda a \sigma \gamma o i ́$ (the ancients) ; ${ }^{\ell} \rho \varepsilon \beta$ Ко beside Skr. rag'as (darkness), Goth. riquis (darkness); $\tau$ á $\rho($ Oos beside Skr. targ' $^{\prime}$ (to threaten). When $\beta$ represents an older gv we occasionally find instead of it the dialectic variety $\zeta$, as in Ar-
 same root as $\beta$ ooá, Skr. gar (to devour), L. vorare ; Arkad.
 for $\delta$ in Thess. $B \omega \delta \omega \dot{\nu}=\Delta \omega \delta \omega \nu \eta$ for $\Delta F \omega \delta \omega \nu \eta$ from R. $\delta \iota F$, Skr. div (to shine), whence come Zeṽs, $\delta i o s, \delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o s$, L. divus, as L. bis and bonus arise from duis and duonus ; Æol. $\beta \varepsilon \lambda \phi$ is $=\delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi i s$, connected with Skr. grah for grabh (concipere), Skr. garbhas (nom. sing. masc. a child), Z. garewa (fœtus), Gr. $\beta \rho \varepsilon ́ \phi o s, ~ \delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi u ́ s, \delta o \lambda \phi o ́ s ~(i ̣ ~ \mu i ̄ \tau \rho a, ~ H e s y c h),. ~ \delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi i ́ s ~ t h u s ~$ meaning "the fish with the belly;"* Æol. Be $\lambda \phi \circ$ í $=\Delta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \phi o i$, from last root, and perhaps so called from its position in a deep ravine; $\dagger$ Æol. $\sigma a ́ \mu \beta a \lambda o \nu=\sigma a ́ \nu \delta a \lambda o v$, borrowed from Pers. sandal (a shoe) $\ddagger \ddagger$ Æol. $\beta \lambda \tilde{\eta} \rho=\delta \varepsilon ́ \lambda \varepsilon a \rho$, connected with סólos, L. dolus, O. N. tâl (fraud). We have also Dor. ódèós $=o j \beta_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{o ́ s}$, where $\delta$ and $\beta$ represent an original $g v$, if this word belong to the same root as $\beta \varepsilon \in \lambda o s, ~ \beta \varepsilon \lambda o ́ \nu \eta$, $\beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, Skr. gal (to fall).

[^31]$\Phi=$ I. E. bh: R. $\phi \varepsilon \rho, \phi \varepsilon \rho \omega$, Skr. bhar (to bear), L. fero, Goth. baira ( $\phi$ ¢́ $\omega$ ) ; фоа́тŋр (member of a фратрía), Skr. $b h r a ̂ t a ̂$ (nom. sing. brother), L. frater, Goth. brôthar; R. $\phi v$, $\phi \dot{v} \omega$, Skr. bhû (to be), L. fui; R. фa $\rho$, фápos (a plough), фáp$a \gamma \xi$ (a ravine), Z. bar (to bore), L. forare. In ví申a (acc. snow), $\phi$ represents an I. E. ghv, L. ningu-it, nix, St. niv for nigv. We find $\phi$ and $\chi$ interchanged in $\phi \lambda_{\iota a}$ ós beside $\chi \lambda^{-}$a@ós (Hesych.), Æol. av̋ $\emptyset \eta \nu=a \grave{v} \chi \grave{\eta} \nu, \delta a ́ \phi \nu \eta=$ Thess. $\delta a v ́ \chi \nu \eta$, where $\chi$ is perhaps original, if the root be Skr. dah for dagh (to burn).* Similarly in Latin we find $f=$ I. E. $g h$ in fri-are $=\chi \varrho i-\varepsilon \imath \nu, \& c$.
$\Phi$ sometimes takes the place of $\theta$, especially in the Æolic
 (Sappho.I. 1) $\dagger$; Жol. $\phi \dot{\eta} \rho=\theta \dot{\eta} \rho$; Æol. фоíva $=\theta$ oív ( a feast) ; фa@vuós (bold, Hesych.), beside $\theta \rho a \sigma u ́ s$ with $\rho$ for $\rho \rho$,
 side Skr. kathina (vas fictile). Similarly L. $f=$ I. E. $d h$, in L. fera, Gr. $\theta$ দ́p, L. fumus = Skr. dhûmas (smoke) ; L. famulus, Skr. dhâman (a house), Gr. $\tau i \theta \eta \mu t$, R. $\theta \varepsilon$, Skr. dhâ (to place). Grassmann suggests that in such cases the initial sound originally was $d h v$; but, though this in some cases may be true, it is very unlikely that it is so in all. We can explain the interchange of $f$ and $d h$ much more easily; for we know that if, in pronouncing $d h$ or $t h$, we move the lower lip very slightly towards the upper teeth, we change them into $f$.
$\Phi=$ I. E. $p$ in some cases : $\kappa ะ \phi a \lambda \eta$, Skr. kapâla (cranium); $\beta \lambda \varepsilon ́ \phi \alpha \rho o \nu$ from $\beta \lambda_{\varepsilon ́ \pi} \boldsymbol{\sigma} \omega$. In $\tau \dot{\prime} \phi \omega$, R. $\tau \cup \phi$ for $\theta v \phi$ (to smoke), beside Skr. dhûp (suffire), dhûpayâmi, and $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \phi \omega$, R. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \phi$, Skr. sthapâyâmi (I place), $\phi$ has arisen from an older $p$, which was employed to form causatives from the roots $d h \hat{u}$ (to move), and sthâ (to stand.)

M = I. E. $m: \stackrel{a}{\mu} \mu a$, Skr. samâ (together), L. simul; R. ${ }^{\ddagger} \mu$, ${ }_{\xi} \mu^{\ell} \omega$, Skr. vam (to vomit), L. vomo ; ínt-, ท̈ $\mu \iota \sigma v$, Skr. sâmi-,

[^32]L. semi- ; ض̣цє́ $\mu a$, Skr. ram (to rejoice), Goth. rimis (peace); $\mu \varepsilon$, Skr. and Z. $m a$, L. $m e ; \mu \varepsilon \sigma \sigma o s=$ Skr. madhyas $=$ L. $m e-$ dius. We find $\mu$ used for $\pi$ in Kret. ä $\mu a \kappa \iota \varsigma=\not \approx \pi a \xi$; Lak. $\delta$ o$\lambda о \mu a ́ \nu=\delta o ́ \lambda о \pi a$ (a spy), Lac. Mє९бєфóva $=$ Пє $\sigma \varepsilon ф о ́ v a$; and $\mu$ for $\beta$ in Lak. ${ }^{\prime} \mu \nu \sigma \sigma o \varsigma=\not{a} \beta v \sigma \sigma o s$, and Lak. $\dot{\alpha} \mu a ́ \kappa \iota o v={ }^{\prime} \beta a \xi$.
§. 56. The Spirant $Y$.
Although the Greek alphabet contained no special sign for the palatal spirant, traces of its presence are found even more extensively than of that of the Digamma. $Y$ must have existed in Græco-Italic times, and even in Greek till after the separation of the dialects from each other. In Homer we find traces of $y$ in the frequent lengthening of short syllables before $\ddot{\omega}_{\varsigma}(=y \omega \varsigma)$, as oै $\rho \nu \iota \theta \varepsilon \varsigma \ddot{\omega}_{\varsigma}, \pi \varepsilon \lambda_{\varepsilon \kappa v \varsigma} \ddot{\omega}_{\varsigma}$, \&c. Yis both a spirant and a semivowel, and hence is easily vocalized.
$Y=\imath: ~ i \delta i ́ \omega=$ Skr. svidyâmi (sudo); $\varepsilon(\sigma) i \eta \nu=$ Skr. (a)-sy$\hat{a} m=\mathrm{L}$. (e)siem ; -o七o (gen. sing. term. of o-declension) $=$ Skr. -asya, as in $i \pi \pi \pi o \iota=$ Skr. as'vasya; - $\boldsymbol{\iota}$ oues (first plural of Doric future) $=$ Skr. -syâmas, as in Dor. $\pi \rho a \xi i o \mu \varepsilon \varsigma, \phi v \lambda a \xi i-$ o $\mu \varepsilon$ s, beside Skr. tôtsyâmas, \&c.; -ı $\omega \nu$ (term. of comparative) $=$ I. E. -yans, Skr. -îyans, as in $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta i ́ \omega v=$ Skr. svâdîyans, \&c.; $\pi a ́ \tau \rho \iota o \varsigma=$ Skr. pitryas, \&c.; $\phi \theta \varepsilon i \rho \omega=\phi \theta \varepsilon \rho y \omega$, \&c. According to Curtius, we find initial $/$ for $y$ only in proper names like 'Iáovєs = Yavanas,* and in į́́vaı beside Skr. yâ.
$Y=\varepsilon$ : in the Doric future $\iota$ is kept only before $o$-sounds, as in $\pi \rho a \xi i(\omega), \pi \rho a \xi i o \mu \varepsilon \varsigma, \& c$. ; but before $e$-sounds it becomes $\varepsilon$, as in $\varepsilon \rho \gamma a \xi \tilde{\eta} \tau a \iota$; in milder Doric $\iota$ always becomes $\varepsilon$, as in
 from $\tau \iota+o$; Argive $\ddot{\omega}^{\omega} \beta_{\varepsilon a}$ (eggs) $=\dot{\omega} \mathrm{F} y a$, I. E. âvyam, according to Benfey, being a neuter adjective, meaning, "what comes from a bird," from I. E. avi- (a bird) ; $\Delta \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} v v \sigma a s=\Delta i o^{-}$


* Curtius is wrong here, for Yavanas is a borrowed word. 'láoves, however, may be equivalent to Skr . yuvânas.



 L. janitrices, ya becoming $\varepsilon \varepsilon$, and this again $\varepsilon \iota$; $\varepsilon \tilde{v} \tau \varepsilon=$ ह̇ov $\varepsilon$
 forms as $\pi o ́ \lambda_{\varepsilon \omega} \varepsilon \varsigma, \varepsilon$ does not stand for $y$, but $\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon \omega \varsigma=\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon o s$ for $\pi o \lambda \varepsilon y o s, \varepsilon y$ being the guna of $\iota$. Curtius considers that є in $\delta \omega \rho \varepsilon a ́, ~ \sigma v к \varepsilon ́ a, ~ к \rho a \nu \varepsilon ́ a, ~ \& c ., ~ b e s i d e ~ \delta \omega \rho ı a ́ ~(H e s y c h),. ~ \sigma v к ı ́ a, ~$ кралía, \&c., represents $\varepsilon y$, and not $y$; these words being originally collectives in $-y \hat{a}$; $\delta \omega \rho \varepsilon a ́$, from an older $\delta \omega \rho \varepsilon \iota a$, means, therefore, "a collection of gifts;" бvкє́a, "a collection of figs;" and hence "the fig tree" itself, \&c. Similarly $\tau_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda_{\varepsilon о \varsigma}=\tau_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda_{\varepsilon \iota \circ}$ for $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \sigma y o \varsigma, \gamma \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon a ́=\gamma^{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \iota a$ for $\gamma^{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon \sigma y a$. In Modern Greek we sometimes find the old $\varepsilon$ represented by $y$; and even in ancient times $\varepsilon$ before vowels must have had a peculiar pronunciation, since we find $\theta_{\varepsilon o i ́, ~ v e ́ a, ~ \& c ., ~ f r e q u e n t l y ~}^{\text {a }}$ treated as monosyllables. The Modern Greeks also frequently represent the $y$ of other languages by $\varepsilon$, as Béa $a=$ Skr. Vyâsa ('I $\nu \delta \iota \kappa a i ̀ \mu \varepsilon \tau a \emptyset \varrho a ́ \sigma \varepsilon ı s$ of Galanus).
$Y=\boldsymbol{v}$ in кúavos (a dark blue substance) = Skr. sýâmas (dark), $v$ here being equivalent to $u^{i}$.
$Y=$ Spiritus asper: $\tilde{\eta} \pi a \rho$, Skr. yakrt (liver); L. jecur; $\dot{v} \mu \varepsilon i s$, Skr. yushmat (abl. pl.) ; ©̈ $\rho a$, Z. yâre (a year) ; í $\sigma \mu i \nu \eta$, R. $\dot{v} \theta=$ Skr. $y u d h$ (to fight) ; á $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \iota o s=$ Skr. yag'yas (to be honoured by sacrifice).
$Y$ has disappeared in Æol. $v^{\prime} \mu \mu \varepsilon s$; fut. term. $-\sigma \omega=$ Dor. $\sigma^{\prime} i \omega$, from I. E. $-s y \hat{a} m i$; term. s. $-\varepsilon \in \omega,-\alpha^{\prime} \omega,-o^{\prime} \omega$, as $\tau \varepsilon \lambda_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \omega$ for $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon \sigma y \omega$, фор $\varepsilon$ ' $\omega$ = Skr. bharayâmi, \&c.; gen. term. ov for oo $=o \iota o=o \sigma \iota=$ Skr. $a s y a$, as in $i \pi \pi \pi o v=i \pi \pi \circ \iota$, \&c. ; $\pi \lambda$ źo $\nu$ beside $\pi \lambda \varepsilon i ̋ \nu$; Æol. $\pi a ́ \lambda a o s, ~ a ̉ \lambda a ́ \theta \varepsilon a, ~ \lambda a \chi o ́ \eta \nu, ~ b e s i d e ~ \pi a \lambda a ı o ́ s, ~$

$Y=\gamma:$ ü $\gamma$ ov $\rho$ os $=a ̈ \omega \rho o s, \quad$ ä $\gamma o v \rho o v$ being read by Aristo-

[^33]
 and ü $\gamma \gamma \varepsilon \mu \circ \varsigma$（ $\sigma v \lambda \lambda a \beta$ и́，Hesych．）from root $\gamma \alpha \mu=$ Skr．yam（to

 $\Phi_{\iota a}{ }^{\prime} i_{a}=\Phi_{1} \gamma a \lambda i ́ a, \gamma$ appears to have been lost from its ap－ proximating to the sound of $y$ ．In L．spargo $=\sigma \pi \varepsilon i \rho \omega$ for $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho y \omega, g=y$ ．In Modern Greek $\gamma$（pronounced $y$ ）has arisen from and beside the old $\imath$ ，as in $\chi \omega \rho \gamma a ́=\chi \omega \rho \iota \dot{\iota}, \mu v i \gamma a$ $=\mu \nu i ̈ a, \kappa \lambda a i ́ \gamma \omega=\kappa \lambda a^{i} \omega$ ，aủ $\gamma o ́ v$（an egg）＝I．E．âvyam．Cur－ tius remarks that the Doric future term．$-\xi_{\omega}$ of verbs in $-\zeta \omega$ ， as $\delta \iota \kappa a ́ \zeta \omega$ ，Dor．fut．$\delta_{\iota \kappa} \xi \bar{\xi} \bar{\omega}$ ，is a proof that the old $y$ was not far removed from the gutturals．
$\mathrm{Y}=\zeta: \zeta_{\varepsilon \alpha}$（spelt），Skr．yava（barley）；R．弓 $\varepsilon_{\varsigma}, \zeta_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \omega$ ，${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \zeta_{\varepsilon \sigma-}$ $\mu a \iota$（to gush，boil），Skr．yas（to strive），niryas（to perspire）； $\zeta_{\eta \mu i ́ a,} \zeta_{\eta \tau}$ ós（a hangman）；Skr．yam（to restrain）；$\zeta_{\eta \tau \varepsilon}{ }^{\varepsilon} \omega$ ， Skr．yat（to strive），which is connected with $y \hat{a}$（to go）； そi¢vфov，a tree，the fruit of which is called jujuba；弓vбóv ＝Skr．yugam，L．jugum ；广由رós（soup），Skr．yusha（pease
 Heysch．），Skr．$y u$（to bind）；in the verbal terminations $-a \zeta \omega$ ， －ı $\omega$ ，beside Skr．－ayâmi，which became in Greek either $-a \zeta \omega$ ，or，by the falling out of $y,-a \omega,-o \omega,-\varepsilon \omega,-\bar{\omega}$ ．In these cases the original $y$ produced $d$ before it，and this $d y$ becamé $d z$ and then $z$ ．We find a similar phenomenon in other lan－ guages；thus we have Ital．diacere，diacinto，maggiore，from L．jacere，hyacinthus，major；Middle Lat．madius，from L．ma－ jus；Mod．Gr．Sıáкı，from oiókıov（the tiller）；Goth．daddja （lacto）$=$ O．H．G．tâju，Skr．dhayâmi ；Goth．tvaddjê，for tvajê， gen．of tvai；Goth．iddja（I went）＝Skr．iyâya，Gr．そ̈ía．This assumption by $y$ of a parasitic $d$ is similar to that by $v$ of a parasitic $g$ ，in Ital．guastar，from L．vastare，\＆c．When $y$ had assumed this parasitic $d$ ，it frequently became $\delta_{\iota}$ instead of $\zeta$ ， as in the suffix－$\delta \iota o s$, in $\delta \iota x \theta$ á $\delta \iota o s, \rho \eta_{i} \delta i o s, \& c .$, and the


Tivádoos. The corresponding patronymics in Skr. end in -êyas (nom. sing. masc.), dâsêyas (the son of a slave), from dâsa (a slave); and in Latin in -ejus, plebejus, Pompejus, \&c. The termination of "íoos (Dor. Fídos) is explained in the same way by Curtius; the root is $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}$ for $\sigma$ F $\varepsilon$, Skr. sva,

 as Tóṕṕaıos (Ahrens, "De Dial. Æol.," p. 158), are related to
 some cases, so $\delta \iota$ becomes $\delta \varepsilon$, as in the term - $\delta$ हos, Att. $\delta o u{ }_{\mathrm{u}}$, $\dot{a} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi i \delta \delta \sigma o s, A t t . a \dot{d} \delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi i \delta o v ̃ s$. We frequently find $y$, after it has produced before it the parasitic $\delta$, vanishing and $\delta$ alone remaining; Bœot. $\delta u \gamma o ́ v=\zeta v \gamma o ́ v ;$ Bœot. $\delta \omega \mu o ́ s=\zeta \omega \mu o ́ s ;$ Dor. $\delta a \tau \varepsilon{ }^{\prime} v$
 ghyas, whence Skr. hyas, L. heri, hes-ternus ; joïß $\bar{\delta}$ os (a rushing
 ed by Curtius either with L. rumor, or with R. $\dot{\rho} v$ (to flow),
 connects $\delta$ in with L. jam, Goth. $j u$ (already) ; he treats $\delta i n$ as an instrumental, and jam as a locative of the same pronominal root $j a$. Beside Hom. a $\mu \mu \underline{\rho} \rho \delta \omega$ (I rob), Pindar has à $\mu \varepsilon \dot{\varepsilon} \rho \omega$,
 by metathesis, which is for exivya, a feminine form of éxıs; this feminine termination - vya is found directly in $\pi \dot{\text { órva }} \boldsymbol{v a}$, as
 to the Latin forms gallina, regina, Diana for Deana, and this again for Deaina, Deania, and as - $\nu \nu a$ by assimilation in the
 which is related to the older form $\mu$ ó̀ußos, as $\chi$ Øovoiov to $\chi \rho v \sigma o ́ s . \quad$ ' $\mathrm{P} \dot{\beta} \beta \delta \delta_{o s}$ is for $\dot{\rho} a \beta \delta y o s=\dot{\rho} a \pi \delta y o s=\dot{\rho} a \pi y$ os, which is
 лaFiakos from ^áios (popular) from daFós (the people).*

[^34]
## §．57．The Digamma．

The sound of $\mathbf{F}$ was very nearly the same as that of the E．$w$ ．Dionysius of Halikarnassus defines it as ov $\sigma v \lambda \lambda a \beta \grave{\eta}$
 and，as a semivowel，is easily vocalized．
$F=v$ ：We have six cases where initial $\mathbf{F}$ becomes $\boldsymbol{v}$ ： vádך（a worm，Hesych．）vádєтal（it breeds worms，Hesych．），
 （Herod．I．，167），the Italian town commonly called Elea or
 a nom．$\dot{v} \varepsilon \sigma \tau a \xi$ ，from R． $\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon \in}$（to clothe），L．vestis ；vín（the vine），viouv（the wild vine），connected with L．viere，vitis，with which Curtius also connects oivos and L．vinum ；ví $\lambda \eta$（a host， Hesych．），beside Lacon．$\beta_{\varepsilon} i^{\prime} \eta={ }^{\prime}{ }^{\wedge} \lambda \eta$（a host），from R． $\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon} \lambda$ ， Skr．var（to surround）；v $\rho \varepsilon \varepsilon \gamma a \lambda$ ह́ov（a cleft），beside Hom．
 middle of words ：$\kappa \dot{v} \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ Skr．s＇vâ（a dog）；$\kappa v v^{\prime} \omega$（I am preg－ nant），Skr．s＇vayâmi（I swell）；ti入ú $\omega$ ，L．volvo ；ßídvou（or $\beta i \delta \delta o l$ ，certain Spartan magistrates），meaning $\sigma v v i ́ \sigma \tau o \rho \varepsilon \varsigma, \mu$ ，$\rho$－ $\tau v \rho \varepsilon \varsigma$ ，from R． $\mathbf{F i} \delta$ ，and suffix $-\mathbf{F o},-\mathbf{F} a=$ Skr．$-v a$ ，and L．$-v o$ ， $-v a$ ，$\beta i \delta i v o s$（Att．ióvos or ióvios）．When $F$ is vocalized， it is frequently thrown back into the preceding syllable，as in raṽoos through ravpFos，from tapFos＝Gall．tarvos；Ion．
 from $\gamma_{0 \nu F o s, ~ \gamma o v F a, ~ g e n . ~ s i n g . ~ a n d ~ n o m . ~ p l . ~ o f ~ \gamma o ́ v v ; ~ \delta o v p o ́ s ~}^{\text {s．}}$ from סopFos，gen．sing．of סópv；où入aí（Att．ò $\lambda a i ́, ~ L . ~ m o l a), ~$ from ò $\lambda F a t$ ，as the Syracusan word $\dot{o} \lambda \beta a \chi$ б́iov（a bread bas－ ket）proves．In the Lesbian－Æolic $F$ between two vowels became $\boldsymbol{v}$ ，and thus formed a diphthong with the preceding vowel，as in av̉us（Lak．àß $\hat{\omega}_{\rho}$ ），фaüos（Pamph．фáßos） （Ahrens，＂De Dial．たol．，＂p．36，seq．）．
$F=0: \delta o a ́ v$ in Alkman $=\delta i ́ \nu$ from $\delta F \eta \nu=\delta_{\imath} F a \nu$ ，acc．of St．$\delta_{\iota} \mathrm{Fa}$（a day）；סoá́б大ato（it seemed）from R．$\delta_{1 \mathrm{~F}}$ ，Skr．div
(to shine), for $\delta \mathcal{F} \alpha \sigma \sigma a \tau o$; दо́aбov $=\sigma \beta$ ќбov (Hesych.), F becoming in the one case $o$, and in the other $\beta$, the root being ${ }_{\sigma} \mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon}=$ I. E. svas, connected with G. sausen (to whistle), and O. S. svistu (sibilus), not connected with Skr. s'vas (to breathe), which is = I. E. kvas, L. queri, R. ques, E. whistle, wheeze, the $F$ is entirely lost in $\zeta_{\xi} \ell \nu v \mu \varepsilon \nu=\sigma \beta \varepsilon \nu \nu \nu \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (Hesych.) ; סoıoí (two) for $\delta$ Floı from St. $\delta$ Fı, $\delta i ́ c$, L. bis; кoá $\xi$ (the croaking of frogs) $=$ G. quak, E. quack; кої'ॄє (to squeak like a young pig) from кoî, G. quiek, E. squeak; "Oa ${ }^{\prime}$ os (the Kretan town ${ }^{*} A \xi_{o s}$ ) the inhabitants of which are called Fá $\xi_{\imath}$ o upon coins, and the district is called Oia $\xi$ is by Apollonius Rhodius, where oı $\left(=u^{i}\right)$ very nearly has the sound of $v$; Oiá $\nu \theta \eta$, or Oiáv $\theta \varepsilon \iota a$ (a Lokrian town), called in Plutarch 'Yáv $\theta \varepsilon \iota a$, from $\mathrm{F}_{\imath}-a \nu \theta_{\eta}$

 рíĺ ; O'ívulos (a Laconian town), also called Beírvdos (Bí-
 called by the later Kretans B $\lambda \iota \sigma \sigma \eta \dot{\nu}$; oívía, oízos (osier), beside 'ívus, 压ol. ßírug for Firvs,' L. vieo, vimen. The Sicilian river "Avıs was sometimes called " $\Omega a \nu \iota s$, where $\omega$ represents F. This change of $F$ into $o$ is similar to that of $y$ into $\varepsilon$; for, as $y$ became first $\iota$ and then $\varepsilon$, so $F$ became first $v$ and then $o$. In $O . H$. G. we find $o$ for $v$, as in snêo $=$ Goth. snaivs. It is not probable that $F$ ever became $\iota$; for then it must have passed through the three stages, $u, u^{i}, i$, which is not likely; and in nearly all the cases adduced in proof of this change, 1 is susceptible of another explanation. Thus in ${ }^{\prime} \ddot{\prime} o v=\mathrm{L}$. ovum, $\mathbf{F}$ was present along with $\iota$, as is proved by the Argive
 $y a$ being a common verbal suffix ; ád $\varepsilon \lambda \phi \varepsilon \iota o ́ s=a \dot{a} \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \mathcal{F}$ os from
 Hesych.) is from ípós, Dor. iapós, and not from St. Fa@v (a sheep), \&c.

After a prosthetic vowel F vanishes, as in Kret. ä\& $\rho \sigma a$,

Hom. $\varepsilon_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \rho \sigma \eta={ }^{\prime} \rho \rho \sigma \eta$ (dew), Skr. varsha (rain) ; ä $\lambda_{o} \xi$ (a furrow), Hom. $a \tilde{u} \lambda a \xi$, Dor. $\tilde{\omega} \lambda a \xi$ for $\dot{a} F \lambda a \xi$, from R. $\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\kappa}$ (to drag); ${ }_{a}{ }^{\prime} \in \lambda^{\prime} o v$ (a prize), for ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon} \theta \lambda o v$, beside L. vas, St. vad (Leo Meyer, however, connects this with L. avere, avidus, and treats

 please), svâdu (sweet) = $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta \dot{v}, ~ \& c$.

 ${ }^{\text {'E }}$ עєтоí $=$ Veneti ; ${ }^{\text {'Eqтía beside Vesta. We find a similar }}$ change in Fr. hors $=\mathrm{L}$. foras, in $\mathrm{S} \dot{\mathrm{p}}$. haba, harina, heno, hijo, herir $=\mathrm{L}$. faba, farina, fonum, filius, ferire.

F = $\beta$ : $\beta$ ov́ $\frac{1}{} \mu a \iota$, R. $\beta o \lambda=$ Skr. var (to choose), L. volo;
 ing), St. ifv ; ó $\rho o \beta$ os beside L. ervum ; ő $\lambda$ ßos beside ódoós $=$ L. salvus, \&c. We find this change frequently in the dialects: in Lesbiáan we find $\beta$ for $F$ before $\rho$, as in $\beta$ рódov, $\beta \rho i ́ \sigma \delta a, B \rho a-$
 $\dot{\alpha} \beta \dot{\eta} \rho=\dot{a} \eta \dot{\eta} \rho, \dot{\omega} \beta a ́$ beside óýn ( $\kappa \omega ́ \mu \eta$ ) and ovaí ( $\phi u \lambda a i ́)$; \&c. We find a similar change in L. ferbui for fervui, bubile for bovile; and in G. Schwalbe, Farbe, Erbse, \&c., from O. H. G. swalawâ, farawâ, araweiz, \&c.
$\mathbf{F}=\mu:$ à $\mu \nu o ́ s=a ̉ \mathrm{~F}$ ıvos beside ơís $=$ Skr. avis, Lith. avinas (mutton) ; $\dot{a} \mu \nu o ́ s$, therefore, is equivalent in meaning to ovilis, and then easily comes to mean lamb; $\mu a \lambda \lambda$ ós (shaggy hair) beside L. villus, vellus, from same root as oṽ̉os (crisp), ${ }^{\imath} \rho \iota \circ v$ (wool), Skr. urâ (a sheep), ̂̂rna (wool); E. wool; $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \delta o ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o s$
 from $R$. $F_{\varepsilon} \lambda \delta$, as is proved by the last form with the pros-
 $\dot{a} \mu \phi \dot{\eta} \nu=$ Eol. $a \dot{v} \phi \dot{\eta} \nu=a \dot{u} \chi \dot{\eta} \nu$ (the neck). Conversely we find $v$ in place of $m$ in Lith. vidùu $=\mu$ ź $\sigma \sigma o l, \mathrm{Ch} . \mathrm{Sl}$. $̌$ crŭv̌̌ ( a worm) $=$ Skr. krmis, prŭvy $=\mathrm{L}$. primus, Skr. vayam (we), Goth. veis (we), beside Skr. mâm (me), \&c.

The change of $F$ into $\gamma$ is very doubtful: we find á $\boldsymbol{y}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{u}^{-}$
 $\phi \varepsilon \nu F o s$ which is related to фáos, Æol. фaṽos, Pamphyl. фáßos,
 which this change is said to occur are words of very uncertain origin.

We find $\phi=\mathrm{F}$ in $\sigma \phi \varepsilon=$ Skr. sva, and $\sigma \phi o ́ \gamma \gamma o s$ beside Goth. svamms (a sponge), E. swim ; $\rho=\mathrm{F}$ in Kret. $\tau \rho \varepsilon$,
 found in Skylax for "Oa $\xi_{o s}$, but the reading is doubtful; in Kret. $\pi o ́ \lambda \chi o s=$ ó $\chi \lambda o s$, but these words may be of different origin, the root of $\pi o ́ \lambda \chi o s$, perhaps, being $\pi \varepsilon \lambda$ found in

 considers the $\pi$ to be due to the influence of the $\phi$ of $\dot{a} \mu \phi \dot{i}$; Lac. $\dot{a} \pi \hat{\ell} \lambda \lambda \alpha=\dot{a} \mathrm{~F}_{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda a$, according to Ahrens, from $\dot{a}=\dot{a}$ (together) and R. $\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon} \lambda$ found in $\varepsilon^{\prime \prime} \lambda_{\varepsilon \iota \nu}$ (to press), aैo $\lambda_{\lambda} \lambda_{n}$ (crowded together) ; but, as we have the forms $\dot{a} \pi \varepsilon \dot{\ell} \lambda \lambda \omega$, Æol. $\dot{a} \pi \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \omega$ (á $\boldsymbol{a} о к \lambda \varepsilon i(\omega$, Hesych.), it is possible that the $\pi$ may be due to the preposition $\dot{a} \pi \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\prime}$, and not to the F. 'A $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda \dot{\eta}$ (threatening) may be from this root, and mean literally "shutting out," "excommunication."

The existence of $\mathbf{F}$ is in many cases shown by its effects on a preceding consonant, as in $\pi$ óvos (Ion, kó⿱o㇒os) for $\kappa$ Fooros, or on a following vowel, as in ő $\chi$ os for $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{\varepsilon}} \mathrm{o}$ os, Dor. $\tau$ т́торєs for $\tau \varepsilon \tau$ Fapıs, Aol. őpavos $=$ Skr. Varunas, beside oujpavós, 㕃ol. ̈̈pavos, Dor. ఉ̧avós, F becoming o, and oo then ov, Æol. and Dor. $\omega$. This effect of $F$ or $v$ on a following vowel is found also in кoסןávrทs = L. quadrans, L. socer Skr. s'vas'uras, L. socrus = Skr. s'vas'rûs, L. soror, beside Skr. svâsar (sister), \&c.; and in the pronunciation of $a$ in E. water, what, \&c.

## §. 58. Assimlitation.

I. When two consonants come together, the first is often made the same as the second. Thus $\nu \nu=\sigma \nu$ in ${ }_{\xi}{ }^{\prime} \nu \nu \nu \mu \tau=F_{\varepsilon \sigma-}$ $\nu v \mu$, R. $\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon} ; \zeta_{\omega}^{\omega} \nu v v \mu l=\zeta \omega \sigma-v v \mu l$, Skr. $y u$ (to bind) ; Æol. фázvoos = фаєбvos from фáos, St. фazs, found in фasoфópos;


 $\sigma \nu v$, Skr. snu (to flow). $N \nu=\tau \nu$ in кav $\nu \varepsilon$ é $\sigma a \nu$ (Od. xv. 464)
 (in Od., but never in Il.) $=\kappa a \tau-\mu$ ороя. $\mathrm{M} \mu=\sigma \mu$ in Æol.

 man, yushman; $\phi \iota \lambda о \mu \mu \varepsilon \delta ঠ i ́ s=\phi \iota \lambda o-\sigma \mu \varepsilon \delta \eta \eta$, Skr. smi (to
 $\pi v \gamma \mu \eta$, Hesych.). $\quad \mathrm{M} \mu=\beta \mu, \pi \mu, \phi \mu$, in ком ${ }^{\prime}$ s (a striking) from R. кот (as L. summus $=$ sup-mus), $\tau$ t́rр $\rho \mu \mu \iota$ from R.

 $\Lambda \lambda=\tau \lambda$ in $\kappa a \lambda \lambda \iota \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \nu(O d . x$ xi. 296) $=\kappa a \tau-\lambda \iota \pi \varepsilon \varepsilon \iota \nu . \quad T \pi=\mu \pi$
 of a Lakonian village) $=\Gamma \lambda \nu \mu \pi i a ;$ пátita (the name of a
 $\mathrm{B} \beta=\pi \beta$ in $\dot{v} \beta \beta$ ád $\lambda_{\varepsilon \iota \nu}$ (Il. xix. 80) $=\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \pi-\beta a \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota \nu . \quad \mathrm{B} \beta$ $=\tau \beta$ in $\kappa \alpha ́ \beta \beta a \lambda_{\varepsilon}=\kappa a \tau-\beta a \lambda_{\varepsilon}, \quad \Delta \delta=\tau \delta \delta$ in $\kappa \alpha ̀ \delta ~ \delta \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon=\kappa a ̀ \tau ~ \delta \varepsilon ́ . ~$ $\mathrm{I}^{\top} \gamma=\tau \gamma$ in кà $\gamma$ үóvv $=\kappa$ кúт $\gamma$ о́vv. $\mathrm{K} \kappa=\tau \kappa$ in кàk корифйv

 (ó $\mu$ ккрòs ס́áктu入os, Hesych.) $=$ кабкós. $\mathrm{T} \tau=\sigma \tau$ in Bœot.
 $\beta_{\varepsilon \tau \tau o ́ v}$ (a garment) beside $\beta \varepsilon \sigma \tau o ́ v=$ écoóv $;$ Lak. кitтo $\rho=$ кí $\sigma$ -



 $\lambda_{\iota} \dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\rho}$ oos beside $k a \lambda \lambda i ́ p o o s$, all from R．$\dot{\rho} v$ for $\sigma \rho v=$ Skr．sru（to


 $\pi \rho o ́ \rho \rho \dot{\rho} i \iota_{o s}$ from Foíha，with which root may be connected $\pi \varepsilon$－
 L．frango ；\＆c．$\Sigma_{\varsigma}=\nu \varsigma$ in $\sigma v \sigma \sigma i t i o \nu=\sigma v v \sigma i ́ t i o v$, and other compounds of $\sigma v \nu$ ，except when $\zeta$ or $\sigma$ followed by a conso－ nant come after，in which cases $v$ is dropped，as in $\sigma \dot{\zeta} \zeta v \gamma o s$, $\sigma \dot{\sigma} \tau \eta \mu a$ ．The $\nu$ in $\hat{\varepsilon} \nu$ is always kept，and the $\nu$ in $\pi \tilde{a} \nu$ and $\pi a ́ \lambda \iota \nu$ is either kept or assimilated to the following $\sigma$ ．$\Sigma \sigma$ $=\delta \varsigma$ in Hom．$\pi \sigma \sigma \sigma i=\pi o \delta-\pi \iota . \quad \Sigma_{\varsigma}=\kappa \varsigma$ in $\delta \iota \sigma \sigma o ́ s, \tau \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o ́ s$
 This is Ebel＇s view，who compares L．nisu $s=$ nixus．Ch．Sl． desinu（dexter），Ir．des（dexter），Ir．ass and ess $=$ L．ex beside echtar（extra），Umb．testru＝L．dextro，\＆c．Curtius considers $\delta \iota \sigma \sigma$ ós to have arisen from $\delta \mathbf{F} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ ryos $=$ Skr．dvitiyas for dvityas．

II．When two consonants come together，the second is often made the same as the first．This is very common in Æolic， especially when a liquid is followed by $F, y$ ，or $\sigma$ ．Thus $\nu v$ $=\nu \sigma^{\prime}$ in Æol．$\mu \tilde{\eta} \nu \nu$ os（a month）beside L．mensis；Æol． $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\boldsymbol{\varepsilon}} \gamma \gamma^{\ell} \nu \nu-$
 $\mathrm{N} \nu=\nu \mathrm{F}$ in Æol．$\gamma$ óvvos $=\gamma$ ouvós from yovFos． $\mathrm{N} \nu=\nu y$ in Æol．$\kappa \tau \varepsilon \downarrow \nu \omega=\kappa \tau \varepsilon i v \omega$ from $\kappa \tau \varepsilon \nu y \omega$ ；Æol．$\kappa \underline{p} i(\nu \nu \omega=\kappa$ кoiv $\omega$ from

 in $\ddot{o} \lambda \lambda \nu \mu \iota=\dot{o} \lambda \nu v \mu \iota$ ，as E. ell $=e l n$, L．$u l n a$ ，and E．full $=$ fuln， Skr．pûrna（full），L．plenus．$\quad \Delta \lambda=\lambda \sigma$ in Æol．苂 $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda \lambda a=\bar{\varepsilon} \sigma-$ $\tau \varepsilon \lambda \sigma a . \quad \Lambda \lambda=\lambda F$ in $\pi o \lambda \lambda \hat{\eta}=\pi o \lambda F \eta$ from $\pi o \lambda v ́ ; \kappa v \lambda \lambda o ́ s$ $($ crooked $)=\kappa \nu \lambda$ Fos L．curvus．$\quad \Lambda \lambda=\lambda y$ in $a ̈ \lambda \lambda o \varsigma=\dot{a} \lambda y o s$, L． alius ；фú入入ov $=\phi v \lambda y o v$, L．folium；$\mu \tilde{a} \lambda \lambda o \nu=\mu a \lambda \iota o \nu ; u ̈ \lambda \lambda o-$
 $\lambda_{\bar{\omega}}$ s），beside Skr．kalya（sound）；$\sigma \tau \ell \lambda \lambda \omega=\sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda y \omega$ ；Hom． $\dot{\partial} \phi \bar{\ell} \lambda \lambda \omega=\dot{o} \phi \varepsilon \varepsilon \lambda \omega$ from $\dot{\partial} \phi \varepsilon \lambda y \omega$ ．$\Pi \pi=\pi \mu$ and $\phi \mu$ in Æol．

о̋ттата, ä $\lambda_{\iota \pi \pi a}$ for oै $\mu \mu a \tau a$, ä $\varepsilon_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \mu \mu a$ from the roots $\dot{o} \pi$ and $\dot{a} \lambda \iota \phi . \quad \Delta \delta=\delta y$ in the Bœotic forms $\mu \tilde{a} \delta \delta a=\mu \tilde{a} \zeta_{a}=\mu a \delta y a$ for $\mu a \gamma-y a ; \sigma \phi a ́ \delta \delta \omega=\sigma \phi a \delta y \omega$ for $\sigma \phi a \gamma y \omega ; \sigma a \lambda \pi i \delta \delta \omega=\sigma a \lambda \pi \iota \delta y \omega$
 R. $F_{\rho \varepsilon \gamma}$ and $F_{\varepsilon \rho \gamma}$; the same change is found in Lakonic, as is proved by the examples in the Lysistrata, $\gamma \nu \mu \nu a ́ \delta \delta o \mu a \iota ~(82) ~$ $\mu \nu \sigma i \delta \delta \omega$ for $\mu \nu \theta i \zeta \omega$ (94), $\pi$ отó $\delta \delta \varepsilon \iota$ for $\pi \rho о \sigma o ́ \zeta \varepsilon \iota ~(206), ~ \& c$. When $\delta y$ is initial, we sometimes find it represented by $\delta$ instead of $\delta \delta$, as in Bœot. $\Delta \varepsilon y ́ s=Z \varepsilon v ́ s, ~ \Delta a ́ \nu=Z \eta ́ v, \delta u \gamma o ́ v=\zeta v-$ үóv; Lak. $\delta \omega \mu o ́ s=\zeta \omega \mu o ́ s ; \delta a-=\zeta a-$ from $\delta \iota a ́$ in $\delta a \phi o \iota \nu o ́ s$,


 $\mathrm{T} \tau=\tau \mathrm{F}$ in $\tau_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \tau \tau \alpha \rho \varepsilon \varsigma=\tau \varepsilon \tau \mathrm{Fa} \mathrm{\rho} \mathrm{\varepsilon} \varsigma . \mathrm{T} \tau=\tau y$ in the Attic forms, $\mu_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda_{\iota \tau \tau}=\mu \varepsilon \lambda \iota \tau y a ; \kappa \rho \varepsilon і ̈ \tau \tau \omega \nu=\kappa \rho \varepsilon \iota \tau y \omega \nu ; \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \tau \tau о ́ \varsigma=\pi \varepsilon \rho \iota \tau y \circ \varsigma ;$



 $\mathrm{P} \rho=\rho y$ in the Жolic forms $\phi \theta^{\ell} \dot{\rho} \rho \dot{\rho} \omega=\phi \theta \varepsilon \rho y \omega, \pi \varepsilon \in \rho \rho \rho_{0} \chi{ }^{\circ} \varsigma=\pi \varepsilon-$

 \&c. $\Sigma \sigma=\sigma \mathrm{F}$ in Hom. $\pi o ́ \delta \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota=\pi o \delta \varepsilon \sigma \mathrm{Fl}$ from St. $\pi o \delta \varepsilon$ for $\pi$ od (in later Greek this $\sigma \mathrm{F}$ becomes $\sigma$, as in ród $\varepsilon \sigma \iota, \& c$., which, however, does not fall out, as it represents the old $\sigma \sigma$ ) ; Æol.
 being found in Hom. हैíon and Lak. $\beta \hat{i} \omega \rho={ }_{i}^{\prime} \sigma \omega \varsigma . \quad \Sigma_{S}=\sigma y$ in
 $\nu \varepsilon ́ o \mu a l$, vó $\sigma \tau \circ$, Né $\sigma \tau \omega \rho$, Skr. nas (to come); $\pi \tau i \sigma \sigma \omega=\pi \tau i \sigma y \omega$, L. pinso, Skr. pish (to pound).
III. When two consonants come together, the first is generally made like the second. Thus, when labials or gutturals precede mute dentals, they must be of the same order as the following dental; hence the only combinations allowed are $\kappa \tau, \pi \tau, \gamma \delta, \beta \delta, \chi \theta, \phi \theta$, as in $\lambda \varepsilon \kappa \tau o ́ s$ for $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma \tau о \varsigma$, R. $\lambda \varepsilon \gamma$, үратrós
for $\gamma \rho a \phi т о \varsigma$, and $\gamma \rho a ́ \beta \delta \partial \eta \nu$ for $\gamma \rho a \phi \delta \eta \nu$, R. $\gamma \rho a \phi, \lambda \in \chi \theta$ $\bar{\eta} \nu a \iota$ for $\lambda_{\varepsilon \gamma} \theta \eta \nu a t$, R. $\lambda_{\varepsilon \gamma}$, тиф $\theta_{\eta} \nu a t$ for $\tau v \pi \theta \eta \nu a t$, R. тvт. Before $\sigma, \gamma$ and $\chi$ become $\kappa$, and $\beta$ and $\phi$ become $\pi$, as in $\mathfrak{a} \xi \omega$, R. a $\alpha$, $\tau \rho i \not \psi \omega$, R. $\tau \rho \iota \beta$, $\gamma \rho a ́ \psi \omega$, R. $\gamma \rho a \phi$. Before $\mu$ a guttural becomes $\gamma$, and a dental becomes $\sigma$, as in $\delta \iota \omega \gamma \mu$ ós from $\delta \iota \omega \kappa \omega, \beta \xi \beta \rho \varepsilon \gamma \mu a \iota$
 beside oíza; sometimes this change does not occur, as in àкци́,
 position $\hat{\varepsilon} k$, also in the Ionic forms $\dot{\delta} \delta \mu \eta=$ Att. $\dot{\sigma} \sigma \mu \eta, \quad i \grave{\delta} \mu \varepsilon \nu=$

 becomes $\mu$ before labials, and nasal $\gamma$ before gutturals, as
 Labials become $\mu$ before $\nu$, as in $\sigma \varepsilon \mu \nu$ ós from R. $\sigma \varepsilon \beta$, $\sigma \kappa$ $\beta$ oual; but we find $\ddot{v} \pi \nu$ os beside L. somnus. T frequently becomes $\sigma$ before $v$ and $\iota$, as in $\sigma \dot{v}=$ Dor. $\tau \boldsymbol{v}$, suffix $-\sigma v \nu \eta$ for $-\tau v \nu \eta$, $\phi \eta \sigma i=$ Dor. фatí, фá⿱ı兀я $=$ Hom. фátıs, $\pi \lambda$ oúoıos from $\pi \lambda o u ̃-$

IV. When two consonants come together, the second is often made like the first. Thus initial $\delta y$ becomes $d z$, written $\zeta$, as in Zzús = Skr. dyâus, Osk. $\Delta \iota o v F \varepsilon \iota$ (dat.), O. L. Diovis ;
 $\zeta_{a} \beta a ́ \lambda \lambda \varepsilon i v, \zeta a ̀ ~ v u к \tau o ́ s, ~ Z o ́ v i v \xi_{o s}=\Delta$ tóvvaos, \&c. Medial $\delta y$

 pare L. acupedius; $\chi$ ádaц̆a from St. ұàad, I. E. ghrâd, Skr.

 from R. $\delta \mathbf{I F}$, whence come $\delta i ́ a \lambda o s, \delta \epsilon \in \in \lambda$ os, $\delta \bar{\eta} \lambda o s, \& c$. ; ápí' $\eta \lambda o s$ $=$ ápı $\delta y \eta \lambda$ os from R. $\delta \delta F$.
V. Mutual approximation of two united consonants to each other. Thus $\gamma^{y}$ becomes $\zeta$ through the step $\delta y$ in $\rho \dot{\rho} \zeta \omega$



$g^{\prime} \hat{\imath} v$（to live），beside $\delta i ́ a \iota \tau a=\gamma y a \iota \tau a ; \kappa \lambda \alpha^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ beside $\kappa \lambda a \gamma \gamma \dot{\eta}$ ；

 beside $\chi^{\frac{c}{c} \rho-\nu} \boldsymbol{\nu}(\beta-o s, \nu i \pi \tau \omega$ for $\nu \iota \sigma \tau \omega, \zeta$ may represent $\gamma y$ ，as the Skr．nîg＇（to wash），proves that the root once contained $\gamma$ ．$\Sigma \sigma=\tau y$ in $\lambda_{i \sigma \sigma o \mu a \iota, ~ R . ~}^{\lambda \iota \tau}$ ；$\mu \in \lambda_{\iota \sigma \sigma a}$ from St．$\mu \varepsilon \lambda_{\iota \tau}$ ；
 $=\kappa \rho \varepsilon \iota \tau y \omega \nu$ beside кра́тьбтоs；$\nu \tilde{\eta} \sigma \sigma a=\nu \eta \tau y a$ ，L．anas．$\Sigma \sigma$ $=\theta_{y}$ in Hom．$\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma \sigma o s=$ Skr．madhyas；$\beta$ á $\sigma \sigma \omega v=\beta u-$ $\theta y \omega \nu$ beside $\beta$ a日ús ；коци́боб $=\kappa о \varrho \nu \theta y \omega$ beside кєко́ри $\theta$－ بat．$\Sigma \sigma=\kappa y$ in $\eta$ ท̈ $\sigma \omega \nu=\dot{\eta} \kappa y \omega \nu$ beside $\eta ँ \kappa \iota \sigma \tau о \varsigma ; ~ Ө \rho \tilde{\eta} \sigma \sigma a=$
 ＝óкує beside Bœot．őкта入入os（the eye），and őккоs（the eye， Hesych．）；ə̋ $\sigma \sigma \alpha$（a voice）＝̇̀кya，L．vox ；غ̇ví $\sigma \sigma \omega$（I attack，

 $\beta \rho a \chi v \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho o v, H e s y c h . ~(A h r e n s, " D e ~ D i a l . ~ D o r ., " ~ p . ~ 505) . ~ \Sigma \sigma ~$ $=\beta y$ in $\phi$ á $\sigma \alpha a$（the ring dove）$=\phi a \beta y a$ ，beside $\phi a ́ \psi$（a smaller species of ring dove）．$\Sigma \sigma=\pi y$ in кó⿱宀бos（a slap in the face） котуоs from R．кот．$\Sigma \sigma=\delta y$ in Æol．$\pi \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \sigma \nu=\pi \varepsilon \delta i ́ o v ;$ सol． $\imath \sigma \sigma o s=i \delta \iota o s$ ；Tar．$\phi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega=\phi \rho a ́ \zeta \omega$ from R．фৎа $\delta$（whence
 form $\pi \rho a \tau=$ L．pret in interpretari，beside Lith．prat（to un－ derstand），Goth．fraths（understanding）．$\Sigma \sigma=\gamma y$ in $\pi \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$ $=\pi \eta \gamma y \omega$ beside $\pi \eta \dot{\eta} \nu v \mu \iota ; \phi \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega=\phi \varrho a \gamma y \omega$ beside द́ $\phi \rho a ́ \gamma \eta \nu$ ； $\varrho \prec \eta \sigma \sigma \omega=\dot{\rho} \eta \gamma y \omega$ beside $\rho \dot{\rho} \gamma \nu v \mu \iota$ ；${ }^{\alpha} \sigma \sigma \omega=\dot{a} \gamma y \omega$ beside ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \nu v \mu \iota$ ； $\phi \varrho v ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$（I parch）$=\phi \rho v \gamma y \omega$ beside $\phi \rho \tilde{\gamma} \gamma \omega ; \pi \lambda \eta \sigma \sigma \omega=\pi \lambda \eta \gamma y \omega$
 $\mu a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega=\mu a \gamma y \omega$ beside $\mu a \gamma \varepsilon v ́ s(a ~ b a k e r)$ ；$\tau a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega=\tau a \gamma y \omega$ be－ side ta $\begin{gathered}\text { ós（a ruler）；and perhaps in a few other cases．In all }\end{gathered}$ those，however，which are enumerated here，with the excep－ tion of ${ }^{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega$（which does not appear till after Augustus）， $\phi \rho \dot{v} \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，and $\tau a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ ，older forms of the roots occur with $\kappa$ in－ stead of $\gamma$ ，so that in these cases $\sigma \sigma$ may represent $\kappa y$ ，and not $\gamma y$ ．

## §. 59. Dissimilation.

Mute dentals before mute dentals become $\sigma$, as in ávvorós
 $=\pi \varepsilon \iota \theta \theta_{\eta \nu a \iota}$ from $\pi \varepsilon_{i} \theta_{\omega}$. The ending $\theta_{\iota}$ of the 2 sing. imperative, first aorist passive, becomes $\tau \iota$ when an aspirate occurs in the preceding syllable, as $\sigma \dot{\omega} \theta_{\eta \tau \iota}$ beside $\kappa \lambda \tilde{v} \theta_{\iota}$ : we find, however, $\phi a \theta_{i}$ or $\phi a ́ \theta c$ from $\phi \eta \mu i$. We have also $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \dot{v} \theta_{\eta} v$ $=\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \nu \theta \eta \nu$, from R. $\theta \dot{v}$ and $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \theta \eta \nu=\dot{\varepsilon} \theta \varepsilon \theta \eta \nu$ from R. $\theta \varepsilon$; yet we find $\ddagger \phi u \phi \jmath_{1}$ (the woof) from R. $\dot{v} \phi$. When two consonants begin a root, the first is only kept in reduplicated syllables; hence aspirates are reduplicated by the corresponding tenues.
 $\mu \iota=\sigma \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota=\sigma \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota, \pi \varepsilon \neq$ и $_{\kappa} \alpha=\phi \varepsilon \phi \cup к a:$ similarly in Sanskrit we have babhûva $=\pi$ є́фика, $d a d r a ̂ m a=\delta \varepsilon ́ \delta \rho о \mu a$.* Roots which originally began with one aspirate, and ended with another, replaced the first aspirate by the corresponding tenuis. Thus we have $\pi \tilde{\eta} \chi v c_{s}$ (the arm) $=\phi \eta \chi v \varsigma=1$. E. bhâghus $=$ Skr. bâhus (the arm), beside O. N. bôgr, O. H. G. buoc; $\pi v \theta \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$ beside $\beta v \theta \mu \dot{\eta} \nu$, Hesych. (the bottom) $=\phi v \theta \mu \eta \nu$, Skr. budhna (the bottom) = I. E. bhudhna, beside O. H. G. bodam, L. fundus ; \& c. $\dagger$ We see the effects of Dissimilation in other languages as in L. Parilia beside Palilia from Pales, L. meridies from medidies, L. popularis for populalis beside regalis, \&c. ; It. veleno $=$ L. venenum ; E. cinnamon for cinnamom, \&c.

* Curtius has pointed out that Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin had not, before their separation from each other, already fixed their peculiar laws of reduplication, from the different ways in which they treat groups of consonants of which the first is a sibilant. Thus we have the Latin steti $=s t e s t i$, spopondi $=$ spospondi, while conversely the Sanskrit has only kept the sibilant in the second syllable, as tishtâmi (I stand). We find some traces of this latter kind of reduplication in Greek and Latin, as in quisquilia $=\kappa о \sigma \kappa \nu \lambda \mu \dot{\alpha} \tau \iota a$ (parings of leather) beside $\sigma \kappa u ́ \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota \nu$ (to flay) and $\kappa а \sigma к а \lambda i ц ॄ \varepsilon \nu$ (to tickle) beside $\sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \lambda \lambda \varepsilon \iota \nu($ to stir up). A third form of reduplication is found in L. sisto $=$ stisto, as i $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota=\sigma \tau \iota \sigma \tau \eta \mu$.
$\dagger$ For other examples consult Grassmann in K. Z., vol. xvi., p. 114.

Dentals, when standing before $\sigma$, are generally dropped without compensation, as in ${ }^{\alpha} \nu v ॅ \sigma \iota \varsigma=\alpha \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau \sigma \iota \varsigma, \eta ँ \sigma \sigma \mu a \iota=\hat{\eta} \delta \sigma o-$ $\mu \alpha \iota, \kappa о ́ \rho \check{\rho} \sigma \iota=\kappa о \rho v \theta \sigma \iota, \delta a i ́ \mu o ̆ \sigma \iota=\delta a \iota \mu о \nu \sigma \iota . \quad \mathrm{N}$ also disappears before $\zeta$, as in $\sigma \dot{\prime} \zeta$ vyos = $\sigma v \nu \iota_{\nu}$ vos. N in $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \nu$ is never lost; $\nu$ in $\pi \tilde{a} \nu$ and $\pi a ́ d \iota \nu$ is either kept, or assimilated to the following $\sigma ; \nu$ in $\sigma v \nu$ is dropped before $\zeta$ and $\sigma$ with a consonant following, but before a single $\sigma$ it is assimilated, as in $\sigma v \sigma \sigma i \tau i o v$. In some cases the loss of $v$ is compensated for by lengthening the preceding vowel, as in $\mu_{\hat{\prime} \lambda \bar{\alpha} \varsigma=\mu \varepsilon \lambda a \nu \varsigma, ~ \tau a ́ \lambda a s ~}^{=} \tau a^{-}$ $\lambda a \nu \varsigma, \& c . N \tau, \nu \theta, \nu \delta$, are also omitted before $\sigma$, but are nearly always compensated for, as $\tau \iota \theta \varepsilon i \zeta=\tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \nu \tau \varsigma, \pi \varepsilon i \sigma o \mu a \iota=\pi \varepsilon \nu \theta \sigma o-$ $\mu a \iota, \sigma \pi \varepsilon i \sigma \omega=\sigma \pi \varepsilon \nu \delta \sigma \omega$. N is also sometimes omitted between two vowels, as in $\mu \varepsilon i ́ \zeta o v s=\mu \varepsilon i \zeta o v \varepsilon s . \quad \mathrm{K}$ is lost in $\sigma u \lambda a ́ \omega$ from $\sigma \kappa u ̈ \lambda o v$ (plunder), as in Skr. savyas (left) = бкаıós, L. sccevus; $\sigma \dot{v} \nu=\xi_{v ́ v} ;$ Kypr. $\sigma o a ́ \lambda a=\xi v \eta \eta_{\eta} \eta$ (a carpenter's plane), from

 parrot) ; Ion. $\sigma \dot{\omega} \chi \varepsilon \iota \nu=\psi \omega ́ \chi \varepsilon \iota \nu$ (to scrape) ; á $\mu \mu о s=\psi a ́ \mu \mu о s$
 $\kappa \varepsilon \rho a \tau$ (a horn) ; фध́, $\varepsilon \iota=\phi \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \tau \iota, \& c$. The rejection of $y$ and $\mathbf{F}$ has been already noticed; we may add that $F$ is lost in $\sigma 0 \mu-$ фós (spongy), beside Goth. svamms (a sponge); $\sigma o ́ \beta \geqslant$ (a horse's tail), beside O. N. svipa (a tail) ; $\sigma \iota \gamma$ ń beside G. schweigen (silence); oíônoos beside Skr. svidita (molten); $\sigma a ́ \lambda o s$ (swell of the sea) beside E. swell; $\sum$ cípıos, $\sigma$ źdaç beside Skr. svar (heaven), Z. hvare (the sun). $\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$, as we have already seen, is generally rejected between two vowels; also between two consonants, as in $\gamma \varepsilon \gamma \rho a ́ \phi \theta a \iota=\gamma^{\varepsilon} \gamma \rho a \phi \sigma \theta a \iota$, $\tau^{\prime} \tau v-$ $\phi \theta \varepsilon=\tau \varepsilon \tau v \phi \sigma \theta \varepsilon$, \&c. ; also before another $\sigma$, as in $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon \sigma \iota \iota=\gamma \lambda \nu-$ $\kappa \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ for $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon \sigma F l$, \&c. Initial $\sigma$ is always lost before $\nu$, as in $\nu i \phi a$ beside Z. s'nizh (to snow), Goth. snaivs (snow) ; v£ $v \rho \nu \nu$, L.nervus beside O.H. G. snuor (laqueus) ; $\nu^{\prime} \omega(\mathrm{I}$ swim) $=\sigma \nu \in \mathrm{F} \omega$, Hom. ${ }^{\ell} \nu \nu \varepsilon \circ \nu=\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma \nu \varepsilon \circ \nu, \nu \varepsilon ข \pi \sigma \iota \varsigma$ (swimming), beside Skr. snu (to
flow); vá $\omega$ (I flow) $=\sigma v a F \omega$, Æol. vav́ $\omega$, beside Skr. snu (to flow), and not snâ (to flow) as the Aolic form shows ; vuós (daughter-in-law) $=\sigma \nu v \sigma o s$, beside Skr. snushâ, and L. nurus. It is sometimes lost before $\mu$, as in $\mu \varepsilon \iota \delta \iota a ́ \omega$ beside $\phi \iota \lambda о \mu \mu \varepsilon \iota \delta \dot{\prime} s$, Skr. smi (to smile), E. smile ; $\mu \varepsilon ́ \lambda \delta \omega$ (I melt), E. smelt ; $\mu^{\varepsilon} \rho-$ $\mu \varepsilon \rho \circ s($ care-laden), L. memor, beside Skr. smar (to remember); $\mu u ́ \delta o s$ (damp, foulness), Skr. mid (to be clammy), Goth. bi-
 $\Sigma$ is lost before к in ка́ $\rho \phi$ оs (a twig) $=\boldsymbol{\sigma к а ́ \rho \iota ф о s . ; ~ к і ́ \mu \psi а \nu \tau \varepsilon s ~}$
 (staff) ; кví (a small insect) $=\sigma \kappa \nu i \not \psi ; \kappa а \rho \theta \mu о i ́(\kappa \iota \nu \eta \sigma \varepsilon \iota \varsigma, ~ H e-~$ sych.), beside $\sigma \kappa a i \rho \varepsilon \iota \nu($ to hop) ; ка́тєтос (a grave) $=\sigma к a ́ \pi \varepsilon-$
 scattered) ; бки̃тоц (skin) = ки́тоц, Skr. sku (to cover). $\Sigma$ is lost before $\pi$ in $\pi$ ťvoual (I work, am poor), from R. $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \nu$, beside $\sigma \pi a ́ v \iota s$ (want), G. spinnen (to spin, to do) ; $\pi$ ย́vos (dirt), beside $\sigma \pi i ̈ \lambda o s$ (stain) ; and before $\phi$ in $\phi \eta \lambda o ́ s$ (deceitful), beside $\sigma \phi \dot{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega . \Sigma$ is lost before $\tau$ in $\tau a \tilde{v} \rho o s$ Goth. stiur* (bull); $\tau \varepsilon ́ \gamma o s=\sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \gamma o s$, Skr. sthagâmi $=\sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$, L. tego, Lith. stogas (roof), O. N. thek (roof), O. H. G. dakju (I cover) ; Tvסॄús, from R. $\tau v \delta=$ Skr. tud (to strike), L. tundo, tudes (a hammer), beside Goth. stauta (I strike) ; тúmit beside $\sigma \tau v \pi a ́ \zeta_{\varepsilon \iota}(\dot{\omega} \theta \varepsilon i$, Hesych.), O.H. G. stumbalôn (obtundere); $\tau v \rho \beta$ и́לєı $=\sigma \tau v \rho$ $\beta a ́ \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu$ (to trouble), G. sturm, stürzen (to rush).

## §. 61. The Insertion of a Consonant.

The groups $\nu \rho, \mu \rho, \mu \lambda$, become $\nu \delta \rho, \mu \beta \rho, \mu \beta \lambda$ : thus $\dot{a} \nu \delta \rho o ́ s$ $=\dot{a} \nu \rho \circ \varsigma ; \mu \varepsilon \sigma \eta \mu \beta \rho_{i} a=\mu \varepsilon \sigma \eta \mu \rho \iota a ; \mu \xi ́ \mu \beta \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha=\mu \varepsilon \mu \lambda \omega \kappa \alpha$, and $\beta \lambda \omega \sigma \kappa \omega=\mu \beta \lambda \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$ for $\mu \lambda \omega \sigma \kappa \omega$, beside $\mu о \lambda \varepsilon i \nu$ (to go) ; $\beta_{\rho о-}$ то́s $=\mu \beta$ ротоя (found in ${ }^{\prime} \mu \beta$ оотоя) for $\mu \rho о \tau о \varsigma=$ Skr. martas (mortal) ; $\gamma \alpha \mu \beta \varrho$ ós $=\gamma \alpha \mu \rho \circ \varsigma$, L. gener ; $\beta \lambda i$ ít $\omega$ (I take the

[^35]honey) $=\mu \beta \lambda_{\iota \tau \tau \omega}$ for $\mu \lambda \iota \tau y \omega$ from $\mu_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\iota} ; \beta \lambda^{\prime} \xi$ (lazy), beside $\mu a \lambda a к o ́ s ; ~ \eta ้ \mu \beta$ ротоv $=\eta \eta \mu a \rho \tau о \nu$. In these cases $\beta$ and $\delta$ were inserted to facilitate the pronunciation; consult §. 30. N is inserted in the root syllable of the present tenses of many verbs, as in $\lambda a \gamma \chi^{a} \nu \omega, \mu a \nu \theta a ́ \nu \omega$, \&c., beside $\lambda a \chi \varepsilon i \nu, \mu a \varepsilon \varepsilon i \nu, \& c$. This $\nu$ was originally the sign of the present tense, and is found in its full form $\nu v$ in $\delta$ eíкvvur, \&c. Similarly we have Skr. s'aknômi (I can), s'aknumas (we can), from R. s'ak, yuñg'anti) they bind), from R. yug', \&c., and in L. jungunt from R. jug, tundo, from R. tud, \&c. $Y$ frequently assumed before it the sound of $\delta$, which when initial became $\zeta$, and when preceded by a tenuis became $\tau$, while the $y$ was dropped. Thus $\zeta_{\varepsilon} \dot{v}^{\gamma} v v \mu \iota=\delta y \varepsilon v \gamma \nu v \mu \iota=$ Skr. yunag'mi (I join), L. jungo, \&c.; similarly in Italian we have giacere for diacere = L. jacere, giocondo for diocondo $=$ L. jucundus, \&c.; consult §. 56. We have
 similarly we may derive $\tau 勹 ́ \pi \tau \omega$ from R. $\tau v \pi$, $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon ́ \pi \tau \tau \omega$ from R. $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon \pi$, \&c. In $\beta \lambda a ́ \pi \tau \omega$ from R. $\beta \lambda a \beta$ we might expect $\beta \delta$ in place of $\pi \tau$; but, as the verbs in $-\pi \tau \omega$ were so numerous, this case was assimilated to the others; unless, indeed, the root be
 $\nu \iota \beta$, Skr. nig' does not occur till very late. Perhaps we may

 pound), L. pinso; $\pi \tau \boldsymbol{\tau} \rho \nu a$ (the heel), beside Skr. pârshni (the heel) ; $\pi \tau v \dot{\omega} \omega$ beside Goth. speiva (I spit), L. spuo; ктєív $\omega$ beside каív ; $\pi$ raí $\omega$ (I make to fall), beside $\pi$ aí $\omega$ (I strike) ; $\beta \delta_{\varepsilon} \epsilon=\beta_{y \varepsilon \omega}$ beside L. visium $\left(\beta \delta_{\varepsilon} \sigma \mu a\right)$, Lith. bezdì ( $\left.\beta \delta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \omega\right)$; $\chi^{\theta \varepsilon} \varepsilon=$ I. E. ghyas, whence Skr. hyas (yesterday), L. heri ; $\chi \theta a \mu a \lambda$ ós beside $\chi a \mu a i ́$.

[^36]
## §. 62. Aspiration.

Although most of the Greek aspirates represent the I. E. soft aspirates, yet under certain circumstances we find an aspirate developed from an original tenuis, after the Greek had separated from the other cognate languages. The two chief conditions for this development of an aspirate from the corresponding tenuis are, firstly, the influence of a preceding $\sigma$; and, secondly, that of a following $\lambda, \mu, \nu$, or $\rho$. In the following cases we find the aspirate due to the influence of a preceding $\sigma: \sigma \chi i \zeta \omega$, Skr. k'hid (to cut), L. scindo, Goth. skaida (I separate) ; Att. $\sigma \chi \varepsilon \lambda i ́ s=\sigma \kappa \varepsilon \lambda i ́ c$ (the ham) ; $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \phi \dot{\alpha} \lambda a \xi=\dot{a} \sigma-$ $\pi a ́ \lambda a \xi$ (mole) ; Att. $\sigma \phi v \rho i i_{s}=\sigma \pi v \rho i ́ s ~(b a s k e t) ;$ Att. $\sigma \phi o v \delta u ́ \lambda \eta$ $=\sigma \pi o v \delta \delta^{\prime} \lambda \eta$ (insect), \&c. This influence of $\sigma$ is very common in Attic. $\Sigma$ sometimes was dropped after it had aspirated the following consonant, as in $\tau \varrho \underline{\chi} \chi \omega$ (I wear out) $=\tau \rho \dot{\imath} \sigma \kappa \omega$ (Hesych.) ; vи́ $\chi \omega=\sigma \nu \eta \sigma \kappa \omega$; $\gamma \lambda$ í $\chi$ оцаı (I long for), beside $\gamma \lambda i ́ \sigma \chi \rho \circ \varsigma$ (sticky) ; $\pi \tau \omega \chi$ о́s, beside $\pi \tau \omega \sigma \kappa \alpha ́ \zeta ̆ \omega$ (I crouch); ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \rho \chi о \mu a \iota={ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \rho \sigma \kappa о \mu a \iota, \& c . \quad \Lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho$ aspirate the preceding consonants in $\dot{a} \nu \delta \rho a ́ \chi \lambda \eta$ (a coal pan), from St. á $\nu \theta \rho a \kappa$ (coal) ; $\nu a v \sigma \theta \lambda^{\prime}$ ó $\omega$ (I carry by sea) $=\nu \operatorname{vav\sigma \tau o\lambda \varepsilon ́~} \omega$; suffix $-\theta \lambda_{o}$ $\left(\theta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon-\theta \lambda o \nu\right)=-\theta \rho о,-\tau \rho \circ ; \sigma \iota \phi \lambda o ́ s \quad($ crippled) $)=\sigma \iota \pi a \lambda o ́ s ;$
 ing) beside $\lambda a \kappa \tau \iota \sigma \mu o ́ s ; ~ \lambda u ́ \chi \nu o s$ from R. $\lambda \nu \kappa$; $\mathfrak{\xi} \xi a i ́ \phi \nu \eta s=\varepsilon \in \xi a-$ $\pi i \nu \eta s ; \beta \lambda \eta \chi \rho o ́ s$ (sluggish), beside $\beta \lambda a ́ \xi$; suffix $-\theta \rho o$ ( $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon i-$ $\theta \rho o \nu)=-\tau \rho \circ($ á $\rho о \tau \rho o \nu), \& c$. ; $\tau \varepsilon \phi \rho a$ (ashes), beside Skr. tap (to be warm) L. tepidus; $\theta_{\rho i} \boldsymbol{\nu} u \boldsymbol{\xi}$ (a three-pronged fork) $=\tau \rho i v a \xi ; \phi \rho o i ́ \mu \iota \nu \nu$ from older $\pi \rho o o i \mu \iota o v, \& c$. Sometimes the same effect is due to a preceding nasal, as in ${ }^{\text {en }} \gamma \chi$ os beside

 from é $\chi o v \tau \iota, \& c$. We have also a few isolated examples where a Greek aspirate represents an older tenuis, without being influenced by $\lambda, \mu, \nu, \rho$ or $\sigma$, as in $\tau a \chi v ́ s=$ Skr. takus
 Skr. lip (to anoint) ; кєфа $\lambda_{\eta}^{\prime}$ beside $\kappa \varepsilon \beta a ́ \lambda \eta$ (Hesych.), Skr. kapâla (skull); кєкафךш́s (gasping), beside катv́ш (I gasp), and a few other cases.

## §. 63. Final Consonants.

$\mathrm{N}, \rho$, and $\varsigma$ are the only consonants allowed to end a word. The only exceptions to this rule are $\dot{\varepsilon} \kappa$ (from $\hat{\xi} \xi$ ), ove (from -oúкı), and the interjections $\omega^{\prime} o ́ \pi$, oै $\pi$, ió $\phi$. A final $\tau$ and $\delta$ are dropped, or $\tau$ is changed into $\varsigma$, as in $\tau o ́=$ Skr. tad ; '̈申v
 Final $\theta$ becomes $s$, as in $\delta_{o ́ s ~ f o r ~} \delta_{o} \theta$ from $\delta_{0} \theta_{\iota}, \theta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} s$ for $\theta_{\varepsilon} \theta_{\iota}$, $\sigma \chi_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon}{ }_{\varepsilon}$ for $\sigma \chi \varepsilon \theta \iota . \quad \Delta$ is lost in $\pi a i ̈$, voc. of $\pi a i ̈ s$, St. $\pi a ı \delta$; also $\kappa$ in $\gamma$ úval, voc. of $\gamma v ́ \nu \eta$, St. $\gamma v \nu a \iota k$; also $\kappa \tau$ in äva, voc. of $a ̈ \nu a \xi$, St. ávakt, \&c. When several consonants, the last of which is $\varsigma$, come together, only one is generally retained, and the preceding vowel is lengthened in compensation, as in
 $=\sigma \kappa a \rho \tau \varsigma ; \gamma i ́ \gamma \bar{a}{ }_{S}=\gamma \iota \gamma a \nu \tau \varsigma ; \mu \varepsilon ̇ \lambda \bar{a}{ }_{S}=\mu \varepsilon \lambda a \nu S ; \tau \varepsilon \tau v \phi \omega ́ \varrho=\tau \varepsilon \tau v-$ фотs; $\tau \iota \theta \varepsilon i \varsigma=\tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \nu \tau s ; \delta i \delta o u ́ s=\delta_{\imath} \delta o \nu \tau \varsigma$, \&c. We sometimes find, as final sounds, the combinations $\gamma \xi, \rho \xi, \psi$, as in фó $\rho-$
 have $\lambda_{\varsigma}$ in the single case ä $\lambda_{\varsigma} ; \rho \varsigma$ in $\not \ldots o l$. forms, as $\mu$ áкаря ;
 frequently in the Argive and Kretan dialects, as Típuvs, èvs
 changed into $\nu$, as in $\pi o ̛ \tau \iota \nu=$ Skr. patim ; véov = Skr. navam;
 $=$ L. patrem ; $\neq \delta \delta \iota \xi=$ Skr. adiksham ; ф€́ $\rho \omega=$ Skr. bharâmi. The $\nu$ ह̀фє $\lambda_{\kappa v \sigma \tau \iota \kappa o ́ v}$ in ${ }^{\prime} \phi \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \nu=$ Skr. abharat, $\pi о \sigma \sigma i \nu$, \&c., is peculiar to the Greek language. Schleicher is wrong in treating $\nu$ in $\phi \varepsilon \rho \circ \mu \varepsilon \nu(1 \mathrm{pl}) \& c.$. , as this $\nu$; for the Dor. $\phi \not \rho^{\rho} \rho \mu \varepsilon s$ and the common $\phi$ ¢ $\rho о \mu \varepsilon \nu$ both point back to an older $\phi \varepsilon \rho \circ-$ $\mu \varepsilon \nu s$.

## CHAPTER VI.

## The Latin Alphabet.

§. 64. Tabular View of the Sounds.

| mutes. | SEMIVOWELS. |  |  | vowels. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| unasp. surd. son. | Spirants. surd. son. | Nasals. <br> son. | $r \& l$-sounds. <br> son. |  |
| $\text { Gutt. } c, q \quad g$ Pal. | $\begin{aligned} & h \\ & j \end{aligned}$ | $n$ |  | $\left.{ }^{a}, \bar{a}, \bar{\imath}\right\}$, $\left.\} e, \bar{e}\right\rangle$ |
| Cer. |  |  | $(r, l)$ ? |  |
| Dent. $t \quad d$ |  | $n$ | $r, l$ |  |
| Lab. $p$ b | $f \quad v$ | $m$ |  | $u, \bar{u}$ |

The Romans borrowed their alphabet from the Dorians of Cumæ, omitting the three aspirates, $\theta, \phi, \chi$, as they did not possess the corresponding sounds. Their alphabet consisted, therefore, of the following letters, in the given order : $a, b, c$, $d, e, f, z, h, i, k, l, m, n, o, p, q, r, s, t, v, x . \quad Z$ is still found in a fragment of the Carmen Saliare; but it was soon lost, and was not employed again by the Romans till it was reintroduced in Cicero's time to represent Gr. $\zeta$ in borrowed words, at which period also $Y$ was introduced, as well as the custom of marking the Greek aspirates, $\theta, \phi, \chi$, by $t h, p h, c h . ~ Q$ is the Doric Koppa. $X$ appears at the end of the alphabet, because it was not introduced as early as the other letters, cs or $g s$ being used for it. It must have been adopted, however, before the archonship of Eukleides, for after his time the Greeks used the sign 定. The oldest document in which $X$ is found is the Senatus Consultum de Baccanalibus. Some time after the introduction of the Doric Alphabet at Rome the distinction between the guttural tenuis and media was lost there, as well as in Etruria and Umbria, and $C$ and $K$ repre-
sented the same sound.* Thus on the Columna Rostrata $c=g$ in such forms as leciones, pucnandod, \&c. This force of $c$ was still retained in the abbreviations $C$. and $C n$. for Gaius and Gnoous. $K$ at last was only used in certain cases, as when the words Kceso, Kalenda, Kalumnia, Kaput, were marked by the first letter merely. After $k$ had thus been almost lost, the Romans felt that a distinction should be made between the guttural tenuis and media; and, to represent the latter, $G$ was introduced by Sp . Carvilius, a freedman of Sp . Carvilius Ruga, and was placed by him between $f$ and $h$, in the place of the old $z$. The Emperor Claudius attempted to introduce three new signs-the inverted Digamma $\lrcorner$ for $v$, Antisigma $\supset$ for $b s$ or $p s$, and the sign of the Greek spiritus asper - for $\ddot{u}$. This attempt, however, failed, for after his death these signs at once were given up. The sounds of the Latin language are not so far removed as those of the Greek from those of the Indo-European ; for, while Greek has changed $u$ into $u$, altered the three aspirates from medix to tenues, lost $y$ entirely, $v$ nearly entirely, and nearly always lost or changed $s$ into the spiritus asper before vowels, Latin, on the other hand, has kept the pure $u, y, v, s$, although $y$ and $v$ sometimes disappear, and $s$ between two vowels becomes $r$, but represents the three original aspirates by $f$, or when medial by $b$, and also the I. E. gh by $h$. The vowel-system is, however, very far removed from the I.E. ; for the distinctions of guna and vrddhi have been almostlost; the effects of assimilation and dissimilation are very great; nearly all the old diphthongs have disappeared in classical Latin and Umbrian, and non-original lengthenings and shortenings of vowels continually occur. The old diphthongs are found in old Latin and Oscan, but these have been handed down in too fragmentary a state to be of much assistance. The substitution of monophthongs for

[^37]diphthongs is easily explained, from the assimilation of one sound to the other, $e i$ becoming $\bar{\imath}$, \&ec.; or from the mutual approximation of both to each other, $a i$ becoming $a, \& c$.

## §. 65. Pronunclation of the Vowels.

A had in classical Latin the full clear sound of the Italian a. Long and short $e$ had each two different sounds : $\check{e}$ in intěr, patěr, \&c., sounded like $e$ in E.father ; ěin tempestatěbus, merêto, \&c., had an $i$-sound,* and was supplanted by $i$ in the language of the educated classes, but finally returned to $e$ in the language of the common people; $\bar{e}$ had an $\alpha$-sound, as we see from the O.L. forms quēstores, Victoriē, \&e., and the ordinary forms fēcundus, fēnum, \&c.; $\bar{e}$ had an $\bar{\imath}$-sound, which was anciently written ei, and which Quintilian notices (I. 4, 18, "in here neque $e$ plane neque $i$ auditur"). Short $i$ had a thin $i$-sound; but in vulgar Latin in early times it was generally pronounced $e$, to which sound it also returned in the later Empire. The Oscan had an $i$-sound, for which they used the sign $\vdash$, and which was probably the same as the Fr. é fermé. Long $i$ had a thin $i$-sound, and a broad $e$-sound, which was written ei. In Latin there also existed a sound between $i$ and $u$, equivalent to the Gr. $v$, for which Claudius introduced the sign $\vdash$. This sound was generally found before labials, as in maxumus, volumus, \&c. It approached nearer to $u$ than to $i$, inasmuch as the oldest inscriptions generally present $u$. The Claudian + is only found on inscriptions, in place of Gr. $v$, as in Aeglti, CFcnus, \&c., except once for Gr. $\iota$, in $b \vdash b$ (liotheca), and once in L. g-bernator, on account of its relationship to Gr. кv $\beta \varepsilon \rho v i \neq \eta$. This sound generally became $i$ in Italian, as massimo, \&c.; yet we find it kept as $u$ in It. documento and monumento. O had a clear sound in colo, honestus, \&c., and an obscure one in termination -os, later -us, plostrum, \&c. The L. $u$ is a true $u$, and not the same as the Gr. $v$; for the Greeks

[^38]generally transcribed it by ov, as in Ko $\rho \beta$ oú $\lambda \omega \nu$, Nou $\mu a ̈ \varsigma, ~ \& c$., and in some few cases by $o$ and $v$, as in Потлıкó入as, Фavorúdos, \&c. This proves that the L. $u$ was equivalent to neither Gr. o nor $v$, but that it lay between these sounds. That the Gr. $v$ had not the same sound as the L. $u$ is also shown by the fact, that on inscriptions before the time of Augustus Gr. $v$ is represented by L. $i$, as in Stigio for $\Sigma \tau v \gamma^{\prime}(\varphi$, and Sisipus for Eíov申os, and that they naturalized Gr. $\Upsilon$ in their transcription of Greek words. In later Latin also Gr. v was pronounced as $\iota$; thus we have simbolo, gimnasio, \&c., whence come lt. simbolo, ginnasio, \&c.

## §. 66. Pronunciation of the Semivowels.

$H$ is a soft spirant, though traces of a hard $h$ are found in vexi and traxi from veho and traho. It seems to be hard before $t$, in the Umbrian forms ahtu beside L . acto, rehte $=\mathrm{L}$. recte, screihtor $=$ L. scripti, beside Osc. scriftas $=$ L. scriptce, \&cc., though even in these it may scarcely have been heard in pronunciation ; for we find Umb. subator $=\mathrm{L}$. subacti, and $\bar{a}$ is represented in Umb. by $a h a$, or $a h$. In Latin $h$ had a very weak sound between two vowels, for we find vemens $=$ vehemens, Ala $=$ Ahala, prendo $=$ prehendo, \&c. Initial $h$ in early times seems scarcely to have been pronounced; for we find, in the Senatus Consultum de Baccanalibus abuisse for habuisse, and harenam for arenam. It at last entirely disappeared about the end of the fourth Century A. D. Final $h$ is found only in ah! and vah!
$J$, when initial in simple words, or in the second part of compounds, had the sound of the E. $y$. Hence we see that it is often lost in the latter case, as in abicit, obicit, eicit, coicit, \&c. When it occurred between two vowels in simple words, $j$ had a sound much nearer a vowel, and was frequently written II. This sound is also sometimes lost, as in plous (Sc. de Bac.) for ploius. It finally became $z^{3}$ (p. 13), as in

Fr. jeunế, juge, joint, It. giovane, giogo, giunto, from L. juvenem, jugum, junctum. This change had already appeared in late Latin; for on a very late inscription congiunta is found for conjuncta; cujus is also found written кoGov, and Jesu Zesu, where $z$ is $z^{3}$.
$S$, when initial, or when medial, before and after any consonant, except after $n$, was always sharp. Initial $s$ only occurs before consonants in the groups $s p, s c, s t$, and consequently must have been sharp. Initial $s$ before a yowel was also sharp, for it has this sound in the Romance languages. When medial, it was also sharp before and after other consonants, as is proved by the forms nupsi, lapsus, \&c. It generally vanishes before $m, n, l$, and $d$, as in Camena for Casmena, cena (Umb. çesna), corpulentus, idem, \&c., while in a few cases it becomes $r$, as in carmen, \&c. On account of its sharp sound, $s$ was lost before $f$, as in fallo beside $\sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, \&cc. Between two vowels $s$ was soft, as in the Romance languages; consequently in this position it generally became $r$, as in the termination of the gen. pl. - arum $=0$ sc. - azum $=$ Skr. $-\hat{a}$ sâm (so Goth. $-i z \hat{o}$ led to O. H. G. -iro, \&c.), generis = I. E. ganasas, \&c. $S$ between two vowels was lost in spei for spesi, as we see from the old nom. pl. speres for speses. S had this soft sound after $n$, as in consul, censor, \&c., beside cosol, cesor, \&c. So we find $\mu \eta \zeta_{\varepsilon \varsigma}$ on an inscription for menses, and in Umb. menzaru $=$ L. mensarum. Final $s$ had in old Latin a very faint sound, as we see from its loss in such nominatives singular, as vigil, \&c., in the nominatives plural of the $a$ - and 0 - stems, in the verbal forms of 2 sing. delectare, loquerere, \&c., beside delectaris, loquereris, \&c., and in the adverbs mage, pote, for magis, potis. On inscriptions of the time of the Punic Wars, we find the $s$ of the nom. sing. of the $o$-stems sometimes not written, and on inscriptions of the later Empire we find the same $s$ also omitted. Cicero calls the omission of a final $s$ before an initial consonant subrusticum, which is a proof that in his time this $s$ had a very faint sound
in the language of the common people. $Z$, as we have already pointed out, was lost in early times, and $s$ was employed to represent it, when initial, and ss, when medial, as in sona, Saguntum, badisso, malacisso, \&c. ; hence, to the old Romans, the Gr. $\zeta$ must have had a sound like a sharp sibilant. In the later Empire $z$ must have had a sound between $d$ and a sibilant; for we find such forms as zabolus, zaconus, \&c., for diabolus, diaconus, \&c. In old Umbrian $z$ had perhaps, two sounds-a hard one, as in pihaz for pihats $=\mathrm{L}$. piatus; and a soft one, as in menzaru $=$ L. mensarum. In Oscan perhaps also, $z$ had two sounds: it was soft in the gen. pl. term $-a z u m=\mathrm{L}$. -arum, in censazet for censasent (censebunt), and it was hard in hiurz for huirts = L. hortus, \&c. In the pronunciation of $x$ the siblant predominated, for we also find it written $x s$ from the time of the Gracchi ; hence we find it represented by $s$ in sescenti, Sestius, \&c. This $s$ has also disappeared before $d, n$, $m, v$, in sedecim, seni, semestris, sevir. In later Latin $x$ and $s$ were pronounced alike; for we find visit, bisit, and bissit for vixit, coius for conjux, \&c., and conversely xancto for sancto, milex for miles, \&c. In Italian $x$ has become $s$ or $s s$, as in straneo, esempio, vissi, sasso, from L. extraneum, exemplum, vixi, saxum. Similarly in Greek we find $\xi$ interchanged with

$F$ is a peculiar Italian spirant, the symbol of which the Romans borrowed from the Æolic F, while the Etruscans, Umbrians, and Oscans used for it the symbol 8. From its standing beside the digamma in such forms as frango, Gr. Foíyvvul, frigus, Gr. Fpī̀os, \&c., it is supposed $f$ and $\mathbf{F}$ had the same sound, but this is absurd; for it might similarly be argued that $f$ and $\phi$ had the same sound, from the parallel forms fama $=\phi \dot{\mu} \mu \eta$, fero $=\phi \hat{\xi} \rho \omega$, \&c. Now, though the Greeks used $\phi$ for $f$, as in $\Phi$ áßıos $=$ Fabius, \&c., we know that their sounds were perfectly distinct from the fact that Cicero ridiculed a Greek witness for his mispronunciation of Funda-
nius.* Raumer accordingly considers $\phi$ to have been equivalent at a certain period to $b h v$; otherwise, he says, no one could say $\phi$ in trying to say $f$. Priscian asserts that the only difference between $\phi$ and $f$ is, that the latter is pronounced non fixis labris ; thus there would be produced a strong aspiration. This agrees with Quintilian's description of the sound, that it was formed inter discrimina dentium. The labial element in $f$ was very weak; for we find confero, infero, Umb. anferener, and not comfero, \&c.
$V$, when initial, or when medial after a consonant, had the same sound as the E. $v$; but when medial between two vowels, it had the sound of E. $w$; and consequently in this latter position frequently vanished, as in boum, petii, Gnous for Gnoc$v u s, \& c$. This loss of $v$ became very common under the Empire, when we meet Faonius for Favonius, Flaus for Flavus, \&c. $V$ in the perfect of the $a$-conjugation was omitted by the common people, as laborait for laboravit, \&c., which is identical with the Italian form of the perfect, as in It. lavorai, amai, \&c. In Greek $v$ was represented by ov or $\beta$, as in OUúf $\rho \dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\omega} \boldsymbol{v}$ beside Báṕp ${ }_{\rho} \omega \nu$, \&c., and once on an inscription by ou $\beta$ in M $\eta o v \beta \iota a-$ vos for Mevianus. This shows that Latin $v$ had a sound between ov and $\beta$.

Initial $n$ had the strong sound of E. $n$, as is shown by the fact that it never in this position interchanges with any other sound within the limits of the Latin language. When medial, it was also strong between two vowels, as we see from its being frequently doubled, as in Porsenna, beside Porsena, \&c. It was also strong before dental mutes. $N$ (adulterinum) had a guttural sound before $c, q$, and $g$. Final $n$ had the sound of French nasal $n$, as. we see from its vanish-

[^39]ing in nominatives singular in -on, as ordo, homo, \&cc., ${ }^{*}$ and in ceteroqui, alioqui, and also from the fact that in the old dramatists it sometimes did not make position with a following consonant. Medial $n$ was also weak $\dagger$ before $s, j, v, f$.
$M$ had the sound of E. $m$. When final, it was very weak, and frequently disappeared. In compounds of circum and com it always was lost before a vowel, except in comitium. Final $m$ was sometimes pronounced as $n$ before $n, d, t$, as in cun nobis ("Cic. Orat.," 45, 145) for cum nobis, an terminum for am (= ambi) terminum (Orig. Macrob., Sat. I., 14), \&c., and before an initial guttural sometimes as $n$ adulterinum. On inscriptions of the times of the Punic Wars, final $m$ of case term. $s$ is sometimes written, and sometimes not; but after the time of the Sen. Cons. de Bac. it was nearly always written. In the first century A. D. final $m$ was scarcely pronounced in vulgar Latin, and was at last entirely lost.
$L$ had a strong sound when it ended a word or syllable, or when it had another consonant before it in the same syllable, as in sol, silva, clarus. It had a weaker sound when it began a word or syllable, as in lectum, talis; and it was weaker still when it succeeded another $l$, as in ille. $L$ was probably strong in such words as lac, latus (for tlatus), lis (for stlis), \&c., where a preceding consonant has been lost. On account of $l$ having this strong sound when following a mute, it was frequently separated from this mute by a vowel, as in

* I have here assumed that in the Greco-Italic period these nominatives ended in -on. This assumption is supported by the fact that we find corresponding nominatives in Greek ending in $-\omega \nu$; but, notwithstanding this, the existence of such nominatives is still very doubtful. As regards ceteroqui and alioqui, they may have originally ended in $i$, as other locatives, domi, \&c.
$\dagger$ Priscian asserts that $n$ was weak when it cäme after $m$, as in damnum, columna, autumnus, scamnum, alumn'ヶs, \&c., but this is very unlikely ; for the corresponding Italian words danno, colonna, autunno, scanno, alunno, \&c., show that $n$ here was at least a stronger sound than $m$, otherwise it could not have assimilated to itself the preceding $m$.
dulcis beside $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa u ́ s$, pulmo* beside $\pi \nu \varepsilon \dot{v} \mu \omega \nu$, scalpo beside $\gamma \lambda$ á $\phi \omega$, sculpo beside $\gamma \lambda$ ú $\phi \omega$. This $l$ had a $u$-sound inherent in it, hence periclum became periculum, \&c. In French this $u$-sound overpowered $l$, as in chevaux from caballos, cheveux from capillos, \&c. L, beginning a syllable, was easily interchanged with $r$, as in muralis, floralis, beside solaris, \&c. Ll was pronounced nearly as $l$, as we see from the fact that $l l$ and $l$ are frequently interchanged on inscriptions and in manuscripts.
$R$ was a dental sound, formed by the vibration of the tip of the tongue, as is shown by its being interchanged with $d$ and $s$.


## §. 67. Pronunciation of the Mutes.

$C$ was originally pronounced in all positions as E. $k$. That it was $=k$ before $e$ and $i$, is shown by inscriptions, where we find $\notin$ cetice for LIquitic, dekem for decem, and by its being interchanged with $q, g$, and $c h$, in quercetum beside Querquetulanus, vicies beside viginti, pulcer beside pulcher. C, however, finally became a surd palatal spirant before $e$ and $i$, as in Italian. Traces of this change are found in the interchange of $c i$ and $t i$, in the suffix-icius or -itius, where the Skr. -ika shows that the former is original, as in concio beside contio, where the latter is original, as being contracted from conventio, \&c.

It appears that $c$ before $i$ and $e$ was still pronounced as $k$ in the sixth and seventh centuries, A. D.; for we then find $\delta_{\varepsilon \kappa \kappa \mu}$ for decem, фєкıт for fecit, крouкєя for cruces, \&c. Besides Gothic $k$, was used for L. $c$ as in aikeits, lukarn, \&c., beside L. acetum, lucerna, \&c. Now, if $c$ at this period had become the palatal spirant, neither Gr. $\kappa$ nor Goth. $k$ would have been used for it. $\dagger$

[^40]In Umbrian we find $c$ weakened not only to the pal. spir. $\ell$, for which the Umbrians employed the peculiar symbol d, but also to the dent. spir., as in Volscian: thus we have çesna $=\mathrm{L}$. cena, iseçetes $=\mathrm{L}$. insectis, desenduf $=\mathrm{L}$. duodecim, pase $=$ L. pace, façia $=$ Volsc. fasia $=$ L. faciat, \&c.
$Q u$ was perhaps nearly equivalent in sound to the E. qu, but the $u$ assumed various shades of pronunciation according to the vowel that followed: thus before $a$ and $o$ it was a pure $u$, before $a, e$, and $i$, it was $u^{i}$, and it finally coalesced with a following $u$, so that at last $c u$ supplanted the older $q u u$. In early times $q u u$ was frequently written $q u$, for on inscriptions we find such forms as qum, pequniam, \&c. During the Empire $q u$ was also written $q$ before other vowels than $u$, as in qintce, qa, qe, \&c. The Umbrian and Oscan expressed $q u$ in words borrowed from the Latin by $k v$, as Umb. kvestur, Osc. kvaisstur for L. qucestor. In later Umbrian $q$ is used without $u$, as in New Umb. dequrier = Old Umb. tekuries $=$ L. decuriis, New Umb. peiqu $=$ L. pico. In Greek $q u$ is expressed by коv and ко, and qui generally by $\kappa v$, as Gr. $v=u^{i}$ : thus we have such forms as Koúaסoı, Kovı̣ìvos, Kóìvtos, Kóaסol, Kvpivos, \&c.
$G$ was pronounced as E.g. In Latin an older $k$ was frequently replaced by $g$, while conversely in Old Umbrian $g$ was hardened into $k$, at least in writing, if not in pronunciation, as in antakres beside L. integris, vestikatu beside L. vestigium, \&c.
$T$ was pronounced as E. $t$. When medial, it had a sharp sound, for it was frequently doubled on inscriptions, and in manuscripts, where we find such forms as Attilia beside Atilius, quattuor beside quatuor, \&c. Final $t$ was very weak; for we find it changed into $d$ in quid, quod, $i d$, ${ }^{*} \& c$., and in the old termination of abl. sing., as pucnandod, "altod, marid (Col. Rostr.) ; and it was so weak, that it was sometimes entirely lost

[^41]in old Latin, as in dede, dedro, \&c. In classical Latin $t$ was restored, except in 3 pl. perf. as censuere, \&cc., but in later Latin it was again lost. In Umbrian, final $t$ in the 3 sing. of the verb was lost, as in habe $=$ L. habet, portaia $=$ L. portet, \&e. ; and also in the 3 pl., as in benuso $=\mathrm{L}$. venerunt, \&c. In Volscian $t$ in 3 sing. was lost, as in fasia $=$ L. faciat.
$D$ was pronounced as E. $d$. Final $d$ is sometimes interchanged with $t$, as in the forms aput, at, for apud, ad, found on inscriptions.
$P$ was pronounced as E. $p$. Final $p$ was weakened to $b$, after the falling away of a vowel, as in $a b=$ Skr. apa, sub $=$ Skr. upa, ob $=$ Umb. up, but the original $p$ was restored before $s$ and $t$. Final $p$ was also aspirated in old Latin, for we find $a f$ (Sen. Cons. de Tiburt.) for $a b$. Plautus, however, retains final $p$ in volup for volupe.
$B$ was pronounced as E.b. $B$ could not have had the sound of $v$ in early times; for we find Burrus for Пर́ $\rho \rho \rho$ о , Boblicola an old form of Poplicola, hapeat beside abuisse, \&c. In the later Empire, however, $b$ was sounded as $v$, as we find on inscriptions such forms as devitum for debitum, verva for verba, acerva for acerba, bixit for vixit, laborabit and laborait for laboravit, \&c.

## §. 68. The Vowels.

An original $a$ is lost in sum for esum $=$ Skr. asmi, gigno for gigeno from I. E. gan, patris = I. E. pataras, \&c.
$A=\mathrm{I}$. E. $a$, especially before $c$ and $g$; acus, Skr. $a s^{\prime}$ (to be sharp) ; ago = Skr. $a g^{\prime}$ âmi ; lacrima, Skr. as'ru (a tear) ; ab = Skr. apa (from); animus, anus, Skr. anila (wind); \&c. In Umbrian and Oscan an original $a$ is retained more frequently than in Latin, as in O. U and O.O. anter $=\mathrm{L}$. inter, Anterstatai ${ }^{\text {e }}$ (dat. sing.) $=$ L. Interstitce (the name of a goddess), N. O. amprufid = L. improbe.

[^42]E. = I. E. a : equus = Skr. as'vas (a horse) ; decem = Skr. das'an (ten) ; ferentem $=$ Skr. bharantam (acc. sing.), \&c. This $e$ has in some cases passed through $o:$ verto $=0$. L. vorto, Skr. vart (to turn) ; vester = O. L. voster, Skr. vas (vos), \&c. In Umbrian and Oscan $e=$ I. E. $a:$ N. U. desen $=$ Skr. das'an; N. U. petur $=$ L. quatuor ; O. O. set (sunt) $=$ Skr. santi ; O. O. mefiai (dat. sing.) = L. medix, Skr. madlhya (medius), \&c. Short $e$ was developed in some cases in Græco-Italic times, as we see from a comparison of fero, decem, sex, ego, \&c.,
 existed then, from which in after times $e$ was developed in one language, while $a$ was kept in the other, as in maneo beside
 $\tau 0 \nu$, \&c. Long $e$ was also developed in Græco-Italic times, as in semi-= $\dot{\eta} \mu \iota-$, her $=\chi \dot{\eta} \rho$ (hedgehog), siem $=\varepsilon \imath \eta \dot{\eta}$, \&c.
$\mathrm{I}=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . a$ : ignis = Skr. agnis (fire); quinque = Skr. pañk'an (five); inter $=$ Skr. antar (within), \&c. So also in Umbrian and Oscan, as in N. U. dirsans (3 pl. pres. conj.) from dirs, O. U. ter, ${ }^{*}$ for did, a reduplicated form of $d a$; O. O. ist $=$ Skr. asti (est), \&c. $A$, in becoming $i$, passed through an $e$-stage, as we see from assideo beside sedeo, Skr. sad (to sit); nominis, gen. of nomen = I. E. gnâman ; artificis, gen. of artifex, from facio, \&c. $I$ in some cases may represent an older $o$, as in levis $=\lambda \varepsilon i o s,-l i s$ (in similis, \&c.) $=-\lambda o s(i n ~ i ́ \mu a \lambda o ́ s, ~ \& c)$. -aris (in popularis, \&c.) $=-\eta \rho o s($ in $\lambda v \pi \eta \rho o ́ s, ~ \& c$.$) , imber be-$ side ő $\mu \beta$ роя, ille beside ollus, illico beside locus, inquilinus beside incolo, \&c.
$O=$ I. E. $a$ : vomo, Skr. vam (to vomit); vōs = Skr. vas (ye) ; ovis = Skr. avis (a sheep); morior, Skr. mar (to die), \&c. So represents sva in somnus $=$ Skr. svapnas (sleep); soror, Skr. svasâr (sister) ; sonus = Skr. svanas (sound) ; socer $=$ Skr.

[^43]s'vas'uras (father in-law); socrus = Skr. s'vas'rûs (mother-inlaw). In Old Latin $o$ is kept, where in later Latin $u$ is found. before $s$ and $m$, in the terminations - tos (nom. sing. masc.) and -tom (acc. sing. masc. and neut.), in neuters in -os, as genos $=$ Skr. g'anas, and Venos (fem.), in dat. pl. term. $-b o s=$ Skr. bhyas. In New Umbrian, $\check{\bar{o}}=\mathrm{I}$. E. $\check{\bar{a}}$. This N. U. $\bar{o}$ is represented in Old Umbrian by $\check{\bar{u}}$, and is consequently a return to that older stage through which the Old Umbrian $\check{\bar{u}}$ must have passed, just as the old o has been restored in Italian. Thus we have O. U.puplum, N. U. poplom = L. populum, from I. E. and Skr. par (to fill); N. U. ortom $=\mathrm{L}$. ortum ; O. U. nūmen, $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{U} . n o ̄ m e n=\mathrm{L} . n \overline{m e n} ; \mathrm{N} . \mathrm{U}$. erom (infinitive of verb es, to be), an accusative of an $o$-stem; N. U. aferom (ambiferre), \&c. In Oscan, $\overline{\bar{o}}=\mathrm{I}$. E. $\overline{\bar{a}}:$ O. O. puitirīis* (nom. pl.) $=\mathrm{I}$. E. kva-
 $=\mathrm{I}$. E. kvad; O. O. viü = L. via (but $a$ is kept in acc. viam, via, = L. viam, pam = L. quam, \&c.) ; in O. O. abl. sing. sakaraklī̀d (sacello), although the usual term is $-\bar{u} d$. This $\bar{o}=\mathrm{I} \mathrm{E} . \bar{a}$ was developed in some cases in Græco-Italic times, as in sol-
 ( $d u \bar{o}$, however, is more usual) $=\delta \dot{v} \omega$; $a m b \bar{o}=a \not \mu \phi \omega$. In many other cases, however, $a$ existed then, as we see from the fact that the original $a$ is kept in one of these languages, and $o$ in the other, or it becomes $e$ in one language, and $o$ in the other : thus we have $o$ beside $a$ in domare, beside $\delta a \mu a \tilde{\nu} \nu$, arduus beside ọ̀ $\theta$ ós, dare beside $\delta \iota$ ơóval, cornus beside кoávov, lancea beside $\lambda_{o ́ \gamma} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \eta$, \&c., and $e$ beside $o$ in novus $=\nu$ '́fos $=$ Skr. navas
 Skr. vak' (voice), \&c.
$U=$ I. E. $a$, which had previously passed through $o$ : genus $=$ O. L. genos = Skr. g'anas, Gr. $\gamma^{\text {Évos } ; ~ o p u s ~=~ S k r . a p a s ~(w o r k) ; ~}$ ferunt $=$ O. L. feront $=$ Gr. фœ́оот $\iota=$ Skr. bharanti (they bear); navibus from navibos $=$ Skr. nâubhyas ; datus $=$ Gr. סотós;

* $\dot{U}$, in the Oscan Alphabet represented by $\dot{\mathbf{V}}$, was pronounced as Latin $o$.
quum $=$ O. L. quom $=$ I. E. kvam, \&c. In Umbrian $\check{\bar{u}}=$ I. E. $\breve{a} ;$ O. U. puplum $=$ populum ; N. U. dupursus $(\delta \delta i \pi o \sigma \iota)=$ Skr. dvipadbhyas (bipedibus) ; O. U. and N. U. vinu $=v i n o=0 . \mathrm{L}$. veinōd = I. E. vaināt ; N. U. kvēstūr = O. L. quaistōr. In Oscan $\breve{\bar{u}}=\mathrm{I}$. E. $\check{\bar{u}}:-\bar{u} d$ (term. of abl. sing.) $=\mathrm{I}$. E. $-\bar{a} t$, as in O. O. aragetud $=\mathrm{L}$. argento $; \mathrm{N} . \mathrm{O}$. kenstūr $=\mathrm{L}$. censōr $;-u m$, the termination of the infinitive, which was an old acc. of an 0 -stem, and therefore was $=$ I. E. -am, as in deicum (dicere), ezum [esse, U. erom], moltaum (moltare), \&c. Traces of this infinitive are found in Latin, in venum-ire and venum-dare. It is possible that this $u$ may have been developed in GræcoItalic times, but such Græco-Italic examples are rare; perhaps $\lambda$ úкos $=$ lupus, from I. E. varkas, is one. $U=\mathrm{I}$. E. $a$ in some cases passed through the $u^{i}$-stage, and became $i$; this $u^{i}$-sound was represented by $\vdash$ by Claudius. Thus we have optimus = O. L.,optumus; mancupium (in Plautus) = mancipium; occupare beside incipere from capio, \&c.
$I=\mathrm{I}$. E. $i:$ imus $=i \nmid \mu \varepsilon \nu=$ Skr. imas (we go) ; scindo, $\sigma \chi i \zeta \omega$, Skr. l'hinadmi (I split) ; linquo, $\lambda \varepsilon^{\prime} i \pi \omega$, Skr. rik' (to -leave); quid $=\tau i$, Skr. kim (what); ovis $=$ óis $=$ Skr. avis (a sheep), \&c.
$E=$ I. E. $i$ : index, indicis, from R. dic $=$ Skr. dis' (to point out) ; ignem = Skr. agnim (fire); navem beside navim ; mare for mari, as is shown by maria ; navebos (Col. Rostr.) tempestatebus (t. Scipion, B. f.) from the stems navi- tempestati-. In these cases $e$ is younger than $i$, whereas in the cases where $i=$ I. E. $a, i$ must have passed through an older $e$-stage.
 = Skr. yugam (par); rumpo = Skr. lumpâmi (I break); uro for uso, Skr. ush (to burn) ; tundo, tutudi, Skr. tudâmi (I strike); super $=\dot{v} \pi \kappa ́ \rho$, Skr. upari (over), \&c. Long $u$ sometimes appears to arise from a non-original lengthening of an older $\breve{u}$, as in $t \bar{u}$, Skr. tvam (thou), Gr. $\tau \dot{v}$, Goth. thu, and perhaps in $s \bar{u}_{s}=\tilde{v} s, m \bar{u}_{s}=\mu \tilde{v}_{s}, d c c . \quad U=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . u$ also in Umbrian and

Oscan; O. U. fuia (sit) = Skr. bhûyât, and futu (esto) from R. $f u=$ Skr. bhu (to be) ; N. U. rufrēr (nom. pl.) = L. rubri, Skr. rudhira (blood), N. O. fuid (opt. perf.) and fust (3 sing. fut.) from R. fu.
$O=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . u$, only in fore from R. fu.
$1=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . u:$ libet beside lubet, Skr. lubh (to desire) ; cliens from cluo; lacrima $=$ lacruma, Skr. as'ru (a tear); tibi, Skr. tubhyam (to thee); manibus for manubus; fructifer, arcitenens, corniger, \&c., for fructufer, arcutenens, cornuger, \&c. So also in Umbrian we find O. U. sim (acc. sing.), sif (acc. pl.) from a stem si (a pig), L. sus ; O. U. and N. U. mani (abl. sing.) $=$ L. manu ; O. U. tiu, N. U. tiom, tio (acc. sing) = Skr. tvam.

## §. 69. GUNA and Vrddhi.

The I. E. $a$ is represented in Latin by $e, o, a$; its guna is $o, \bar{e}, \bar{a}$, as in Greek; its vrddhi is perhaps $\bar{o}$ and $\bar{u}$. The guna of $i$ was in O. L. $e i$, later $\bar{\imath}$ and $\bar{e}$, and $a i$, later $a e$; its vrddhi was in O. L. oi, later oe, $\bar{u}, \bar{\imath}$. The guna of $u$ was in O. L. eu, and later $a u, \bar{o}$; its vrddhi was in O. L. ou, later $\bar{u}$. In Latin $e u$, the old guna of $u$, was supplanted by the vrddhi ou, while conversely in Greek the vrddhi ov was supplanted by the guna $\varepsilon v$. In the following table* the O. L. diphthongs are placed in brackets.

| Primitive Vowels | $e, o, a$, | $i$ | $u$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Guna | $o, \bar{e}, \bar{a}$, | $(e i) \bar{\imath} \bar{e},(a i) a e$ | $(e u), a u \bar{o}$ |
| Vṛddhi | $\bar{o} \bar{u}$ | (oi) $\propto \bar{u}, \bar{\imath}$ | (ou) $\bar{u}$ |

* In this table I have followed Schleicher, except that in some cases I consider $\bar{i}$ to be a vrddhi of $i$. Many of the examples given by him to illustrate this table are very doubtful. Indeed, it is almost impossible to separate from each other the spheres of guna and vrddhi in Latin, on account of the almost universal reduction of the old diphthongs to monophthongs. This is also the case with Umbrian. In Old Latin and Oscan these diphthongs have been kept, but then here we labour under a want of materials.
$\bar{A}$ is the guna of $a$ in the following examples : pāx, pácis beside păcisci; läterna beside lăteo ; vägina beside văco; suffrägium beside frăgor, from R. frag (to break); sägire, sägus beside săgax; läbi beside lăbare ; amb-äges beside ăgo, ambigere ; fräter, Skr. blrâtar, from R. blăar, \&c. The feminine of the $a$-stems also ended in $\bar{a}$ originally ; nov $\bar{a}=G r$. $\nu^{\prime}$ f $\bar{a}$ $=$ Skr. nava $($ new $) ; \operatorname{cocta} \bar{a}=$ Gr. $\pi \varepsilon \pi \tau \hat{\eta}=$ I. E. kvakt $\hat{a}, \& \&$. So in Umbrian $\bar{a}$ (written aha, ah) is guna of $\breve{a}$, as in O. U. frātrum, N. U. frätrom (fratrum), \&c. So also in Oscan, as in Staatiis $=$ L. Stätius, beside stätus, from R. stŭ.
$\bar{E}$ is guna of $\check{e}$ : tēgula beside tégo; lēx, lēgis, collēga beside lěgo; rēx, rēgis beside rĕgo: sēdes beside sëdeo; sēmen beside sătus from R. să; and perhaps a few other cases. 1 may be guna of $\check{e}$ in sĩca beside sěco.

O is guna of $\check{e}$ : procus beside precor; fors, fordus (pregnant) beside fero ; toga beside tëgo, Skr. sthagâmi (I cover); moneo beside mens, memini, Skr. man (to think) ; noceo beside nĕco, Gr. vékus, Skr. nas' (to kill) ; modus beside mederi; also before two consonants in pondus beside pendere, extorris beside terra, \&c. $O$ is guna of $a$ in portio beside pars, scobina beside scăbo, \&c.
$\overline{0}$ is considered by Schleicher to be the vrddhi of $a$, especially when an original $a$ in a root is represented by $o$ : persōna beside sŏnus, Skr. svan (to sound); vömer beside vömo, Skr. vam (to vomit) ; söpio beside sơpor, Skr. svap (to sleep); sōdes beside södalis; vöx, vōcis beside vöco; ōcior beside Gr. $\omega$ киús $=$ Skr. âs'us (quick), from R. as' (to be sharp); dōnum, dōs, dötis beside dütus from R. dŭ; gnōtus = Gr. $\gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ s$, gnōmen beside nöta, cognitus; datōrem $=\mathrm{Gr} . \delta o \tau \tilde{\eta} \rho a=$ Skr. dâtâram, \&\&c. $\bar{U}$ is found beside $\bar{o}$ in -tūrus beside -tōr (datūrus beside dator, \&c.) ; term. of gen. pl. $-u m$, -rum , for $-\bar{u} m$, $-r u \bar{m}=$ Skr. $-\hat{a} m$, sâm. In Umbrian we find O. U. $\bar{u}$, N. U. $\bar{o}$, as vrddhi of $a: \mathrm{O}$. U. nūmen, N. U. nōmen = L. nōmen; term. of gen. pl. O. U. -ūm, N. U. -ōm, as in O. U. frätrūm, N. U. frätröm; N. U. kuēstür = O. L. quaistôr, \&c. In Oscan $\bar{u}$ is
vrddhi of $a$ in N. O. kenstūr $=\mathrm{L}$. censor ; O. O. Fluusai $=\mathrm{L}$. F'lōrce from R. fla.
( $E i$ ), $\bar{\imath}, \bar{e}$ is the guna of $i$ in the following examples : divus (deiva, deivinam, \&c., are found on inscriptions) from R. div (to shine) ; dĩco, O. L. deico, beside causidǐcus from R. dic $=$ Skr. dis' (to point out) ; īdus, O. L. eidus (the days of full moon, and therefore the brightest days), beside Skr. idh (to burn) ; is, it, itur (from eo, I go), beside eis, eit, eitur ; difeidens, confido beside perfidus ; leibertinus beside libido, \&c. In Oscan we find O. O. ei, N. O. ei as guna of $i$ in N. O. deicum (infin.) from R. dic ; N. O. deivaum* (infin. to swear), O. O. deévaí (dat. sing.) beside L. dīvus from R. div.
(A $i$ ), $\alpha e$ is the guna of $i$ in aidilis, aedes, aestas (for cedtas) beside Skr. idh (to burn), Gr. aı $\theta \omega$, ai $\theta_{\eta} \eta_{̣}$; aevom, O. L. aivom, from R. $i$ (to go) ; aemulus beside imitari ; moestus beside miser; and perhaps a few other cases. In Oscan we find $a^{i}$ as guna of $i$ in O. O. aiditis = L. cediles, and in Umbrian $\bar{e}$, as in $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. $k v e \overline{s t u r}=0.0$. kvaistur $=0$. L. quaistor.
( $O i$ ) $, \infty, \bar{u}$ is the vṛddhi of $i$, as in foedus beside fides; O. L. locbesum (= liberum) beside lïbet ; $\dagger$ oitile, oetier, ūtier; loidos, loedos, lūdus; moiros, moeros, mūrus ; ploirume, ploera, plures ; coiravit, coeravit, cūravit; moinicipium, comoinem (Sc. de Bacc.), inmœnis, comünis ; oinvorsei (Sc. de Bacc.), œonus, ūnus, \&c. In Oscan we find O. O. $\ddot{u}^{e}, \mathrm{~N}$. O. oi, as vrddhi of $i$, as in O . O. müiniks (nom. sing. masc.) beside O . L. comoinem ; iuttiuf beside oitile, ūtier.
$I$ appears to be the vrddhi of $\hat{\imath}$ in a few cases : mìtis for

* As deivaum in Oscan means ' to swear,' from St. deiva (a god), so in Lettic we find the infin. devatees, also meaning 'to swear,' from St. deeva (a god), devs (nom. sing.) = L. divus.
$\dagger$ The roots $l i b$ and $f i d$ are the only two roots in Latin that appear as well in their simple as in their guna- and vrddhi-forms : thus we have R. lib, libet, leibertinus, loebesum ; R. fid, fïdes, lifeidens, foidus.
moitis, O. Ir. moith and moeth (tender) ; vinum* for voinum, beside Gr. oivos ; vīcus for voicus, beside Gr. oîcos. Schleicher considers vinum and vicus to be examples of guna and not vrddhi ; but it is better to suppose that the vrddhi-forms existed in Græco-Italic times. In Sanskrit the guna-forms occur, vês'as =oíkos and vêna (pleasant).
$E u$, the old guna of $u$, is found only in the proper name Leucesius (Carm. Saliar.), beside lücerna from R. luc. In some other words $e u$ is found, where it is not a guna ; thus we have neuter for ne-uter, neutiquam for ne-utiquam, neu for neve, seu for seve, cerr, heu, eheu, in which cases eu is not the guna of $u$. The vrddhi ou has in other cases been substituted for $e u$, as in dūco, O. L. douco; ūro for ouso, and this again for euso = Gr. $\varepsilon \nu ้ \omega=$ Skr. ôshâmi (I burn), from R. ush='I. E. us ; jūs, O. L. jous, is for jovos, and this again is for jevos, which is formed by guna from R. $j u$ (to join), as $\kappa \lambda$ sfoos is formed from R. $\kappa \lambda v$ and Skr. s'ravas (nom. sing. neut.) from R. s'ru; jūs (sauce) is also formed in the same way from R. $j u$, which is found in Gr. Y̌́un (leaven), and Sl. jucha (sauce); pūs = povos = pevos beside Skr. pûy (to be foul), Z. p̂̂ (to stink); pluont = plovont $=$ plevont $=\mathrm{Gr} . \pi \lambda$ ह́Foví́, whence $\pi \lambda$ éov $\sigma$, from R. plu ; fluont $=$ flovont $=$ flevont, from R. Alu, and similar present forms; trūdo $=$ troudo $=$ treudo, beside trŭdis, \&c. In Oscan also the vrddhi of $u$ appears to have taken the place of the guna, as in 0.0 . tuvtiks (urbanus), N. O. touto (a city) from R. $t u=$ Skr. tu (valere).
$A u$ may be the guna of $u$ in raudus (unpolished brass), from R. $r u d$ (to be red) $=$ Gr. $\rho v \theta$.

Curtius and Schleicher consider also that aurora and augeo are cases of $a u$ as guna of $u$ : aurora and Gr. av̉ws pointing

[^44]back to a Græco-It. ausōs, from R. us $=$ Skr. ush (to burn), this root appearing in its guna-form in the European languages as 0 . N. austur (oriens), Lith. auszrà (morning), while it appears in its simple form in Sanskrit and Zend as Skr. ushâsâa (morning), ushâ (early), Z. usha (morning); augeo beside Gr. aü $\xi_{\omega}$, Lith. âugu (I grow), from R. ug. I have already (p. 65) pointed out that these words are susceptible of a different explanation. Au frequently becomes $o$, by passing through the step ao, which is found in Aorelius, which occurs on an old inscription. Thus we have rödus for raudus, cōda for cauda, \&c. $A u$ frequently arises from $a v$, as in cautus from caveo, fautor from faveo, \&c.
( $O u$ ) $\bar{u}$ is the vrddhi of $u$, as in O. L. Loucina, loumen, Loucetios from R. luc ; rüfus from R. rudh, \&c. In poublicos, ou appears to be the vrddhi of an $u$ that represents an original $a$. In Umbrian, O. U. $\bar{u}, \mathrm{~N} . \mathrm{U} . \bar{o}$ is also the vrddhi of $u$, as in N. U. röfu $=$ L. rüfos, \&c. $(O u) \bar{u}$ in Latin arises also from the rejection of the spirant $j$, and from the vocalization of $v$, as in cuncti $=$ cojuncti, plous for plojus, noundinum (Sc. de Bacc.) for novendinum, nountios for noviventios, \&c.

## §. 70. Assimlation of the Vowels.

One vowel is often assimilated to a preceding one, as in luteolus from St. luteu-, vinolentus from St. vinu-, beside hortulus, truculentus; tristities beside tristitia; siem $=\mathrm{Skr}$. syâm; -iens (in totiens, \&c.) beside Skr. -iyâns; o being nearer than $u$ to $i$ and $e$, and $e$ being nearer than $a$ to $i$.

One vowel is assimilated to a following one, as in exilium beside exul; nihil, nisi, nimis, nimirum beside ne, nefas; familia beside famulus ; bene beside bonus; illecebree beside illicio; soboles for suboles; socors for secors; queam beside quire; O. L. filea $=$ flia; mihi, tibi beside me, te, U. mehe, tefe ; nausea = Gr. vavoía; \&c.

Vowels are frequently influenced by neighbouring conso-
nants. Thus the labials and $l$ prefer $u$, as in $H e c u b a={ }^{`} \mathbf{E}_{\text {кá }} \beta_{\eta}$; occupo, aucupium, beside capio; contubernium beside taberna; O. L. pocolom becomes poculum ; epistula = ̇̇льбто入и́; monumentum beside monimentum ; puls beside $\pi$ ódtos ; sepultus from sepelio; insulsus from salsus, \&c. $R$ frequently prefers $e$ before it, as in operis, cineris, beside nominis ; camera from $\kappa а \mu a ́ \rho a, \& c$. In some cases $r$ takes before it $o$, where otherwise we should have expected $u$, as in ancora $=$ aै $\gamma \kappa v \rho a$; foris beside $\theta$ v́pa; fore from R. fu; corporis, gen. sing. of corpus ; por $($ in Marcipor $)=$ puer. The dental $n$ prefers $i$ in cecini from R. can; machina from $\mu \eta \chi a \nu \eta$; nominis, hominis, \&c. Final $n$, however, changed this $i$ into $e$, as in cornicen, nomen, \&c.

## §. 71. Dissimilation of the Vowels.

The Latin language does not allow one vowel to be followed by the same without the intervention of a consonant, but always changes the first or second of these vowels into another, as $i$ into $e$, and ${ }^{\circ} u$ into $o$. Thus we have pietas, ebrietas, societas, for piitas, \&c., beside levitas, caritas ; arietis, parietis, for ariitis, \&c., beside militis ; alienus, Avienus, \&c., beside peregrinus, \&c.; hietare beside clamitare; variegare beside levigare; laniena beside carnificina; meio for miio, and this for migjo, beside mingo, Gr. ò ${ }^{\prime} \chi \boldsymbol{\omega}$; peior for piior ; ei, eis, $d e i, \& c$. , are older and more classical formsthat $i i, i i s, d i i, \& c$., which were also sometimes written $\bar{\imath}, \bar{\imath} s, d \bar{\imath}, \& \mathbf{c} . ;$ petiei, ostiei, Juliei, vieis, \&c., beside the later forms, petii, ostii, Julii, viis, \&c. Up to the period of Augustus we never find $u u$ or $v u$, but always uo and ro, as in equos, serros, novom, cequom, volpes, volt, \&c.

## §. 72. Vowels lengthened in Compensation.

When a consonant is lost, the preceding vowel is frequently lengthened in compensation; or, if two vowels are thus brought together, they are contracted into one. Thus
we have in the first case pēs for peds ; aries for ariets ; ponno for posno, R. pos, found in pos-ui; comp. term. -iōr, -ioris $=\mathrm{I}$. E. -yans, -yansas ; acc. pl. term. - $\bar{s}=\mathrm{I}$. E. -ans, \&c. In many cases, however, this vowel is again shortened, as in pedĕs for pedēs $=$ pedĕts, patĕr $=$ Gr. $\pi a \tau \eta \dot{\eta} \rho$, for patërs, \&c. Again, we find contraction in fēeci for féficci, R. fac; frēgi $=$ frĕfrĕgi, R. frag; födi for føffodi, R. fod; mōvi for mŏmŭvi, R. mov ; fāvi for făfŭvi, R. fav, \&c. Similarly we have nēmo for neemo $=$ ne-homo ; vemens $=$ vehemens ; $a m \bar{o}=a m a 0$, and other verbs of the first conjugation, \&c.

## §. 73. Weakening of the Vowels.

Vowels are generally weakened in words whose weight is increased either by reduplication, or by composition, or by being formed from other stems by means of suffixes. Thus a becomes e, as in fallo, fefelli; parco, peperci; barba, imberbis; farcio, refercio ; factus, perfectus, \&c.
$A$ becomes $i$, as in tango, contingo ; capio, accipio ; fateor, confiteor ; manus, eminus ; nam, enim ; pater, Jupiter ; cano, cecini, \&c. This $i$ of course passed through the stage $e$, and $e$ is still kept in cases where $i$ might have been expected, as in peperi (pario), tubicen (cano), where the retention of $e$ is due to $r$ and final $n$.

A becomes $u$, as in capio, occupo ; datus = I. E. datas, Gr. סorós; taberna, contubernium, \&c. This $u$ passed through the stage $o$; thus L. datus, and Gr. סoтós, point back to a GræcoItalic datos.
$\bar{A}$ becomes $\bar{e}$, as in hālo, anhēlo.
$E$ becomes $i$, as in lego, colligo ; emo, redimo ; teneo, retineo, \&c. In reduplicated syllables $e$ is unchanged, as in tetendi, pependi. $\bar{E}$ becomes $\bar{\imath}$, as in lēnis, delīnire ; tēla, subtīlis; it becomes $\check{e}$ in the reduplicated perfect pĕpēdi.

Ae becomes $\bar{\imath}$, as in aequus, iniquus ; ccedo, cecīdi, \&c.
Au becomes $\bar{o}$ and $\bar{u}$, as in fauces, suffioco ; plaudo, explōdo ; causa, accūso ; claudo, inclūdo, \&c.

Long vowels and diphthongs are even weakened to short vowels, as in agnitus, cognitus, beside nōtus ; dejěro, pejěro, beside jūro, O. L. jouro.
$O$ and $u$ are also weakened to $i$, as in duritas from St. duro-; corni-ger from St. cornu, \&c. In reduplicated syllables, however, $o$ and $u$ remain generally unchanged, as in poposci, spopondi, totondi, momordi, pupugi, tutudi, cucurri. In Old Latin these forms were sometimes lightened, as we find 0. L. spespondi, peposci, memordi, tetuli, pepugi, cecurri.

In Umbrian and Oscan the original vowel is not weakened, as in Latin, in compounds, \&c. Thus we have O. U. arkani from R. kan (canere), and ar (ad) ; N. U. procanurent from same root as last; O. U. arhabas = L. adhibeas ; N. U. Jupater $=$ L. Jupiter ; O. O. Anterstatiu = L. Interstita; O. O. anter $=$ L. inter; N. O. amprufid $=$ L. improbe ; N. O. fefacid (3 sing. opt. perf.), fefacust ( 3 sing. fut. exacti) from fefac, a reduplicated form of R. fac. If hipid ( 3 sing. opt. perf.), pruhipust ( 3 sing. fut. ex.) be from the same root as L. habeo, we have here a case of $a$ being weakened to $i$, in Oscan ; hip being for hihip, and this for hihap, and therefore having been hip originally.

## §. 74. Shortening of the Vowels.

Vowels in unaccented final syllables are very generally shortened in Latin, and hence a a few examples will suffice. The final $a$ of the feminine $a$-stems was long in Indo-European, and is still long in Sanskrit. In Old Latin it was also long, but in classical Latin it has been shortened. Final $a$ in triginta, \&c., was once long, but in the later poets it is short. Final $e$ of the ablative of the $i$-stems was also long, as representing an I. E. ait or aid ; patrē is still found in Gnaivôd patré prognátus, fórtis vír sapiénsque (tit. Scip. Barb.). We find cavě, jubĕ beside cavē, jubē ; mihư, tib̌ for mihei, tibei ; dư̆,
 for hum $\overline{0}$; final $o$ of the first pers. sing. pres. and fut. active
is either long or short, representing an I. E. $\bar{a}$, as $-\bar{o}$ (in ago, Gr. ä $\gamma \omega)=-\bar{a}=-\hat{a} m i$, \&c.

Vowels are shortened always before final $t$, as in amăt for amāt, \&c. : traces of the original $\bar{a}$ are still found in the Poets, as in Plautus, Terence, \&c. The same is the case with the verbal terminations -et, $i t$, and $i s$. We find also matěr for matēr, Gr. $\mu a \tau i ́ \rho ; ~ p r a t o ̛ r ~ f o r ~ p r o c t o ̄ r, ~ \& c . ~ . ~$

Medial vowels are also frequently shortened, as in docĕo for docēo;"audǐo for audīo; rĕi for rēi; spĕi for spēi; dĕus for dēus, and this for deivos; Dīana for Ď̆ana; unĭus beside unīus ; \&c.

## §. 75. Total Loss of the Vowels.

Final $e$ is lost in the imperatives dic, duc, fac, fer, inger (Catull. 27, 2); in hic, hoec, hoc for hice, \&c.; in voc. fili for filie, \&c.; in imper. audi for audie, \&c.; in amor (1 sing. pres. pass.) for amose ; \&c.

Final $i$ is lost in est $=$ Gr. é $\sigma \tau i ;$ ferit $=$ Skr. bharati; ferunt $=$ Skr. bharanti (tremonti is still found in Carm. Saliar. ; feris = Skr. bharasi, \&c. I is lost in pulvinar beside pulvinare for pulvinari, and similar nouns in $-a r=-a r i ;$ piper $=$ Grr. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \pi \varepsilon \varrho \iota$; facul, difficul, simul = facile, \&c., for facili, \&c.; tot = Skr. tati; $q u o t=$ Skr. kati ; ut beside $u t i, \mathrm{U}$. ote, O. auti ; ob = Gr. $\varepsilon$ ह̇i $=$ Skr. $a b h i$ (ad) ; $a d=$ Skr. $a d h i$ (super, ad), \&c.

Final $o$ is lost in $a b=$ Gr. $\dot{a} \pi o ́=$ Skr. $a p a(\mathrm{ab}) ; s u b=$ Gr. $\dot{v} \pi \sigma^{\prime}=$ Skr. upa (ad); for, as the $o$-stems in Greek and Latin correspond to the $a$-stems in Sanskrit, the Græco-Italic forms of $a b$ and $s u b$ must have ended in $o$.

Medial vowels are lost before either vowels or consonants: thus before a vowel $i$ is lost in minus for minius, semănimus for semi-animus; $e$ is lost in nullus for ne-ullus, nusquam for ne-usquam ; o is lost in unŏculos for uno -oculus.

Medial $a$ is lost before a consonant in palma=Gr. $\pi a \lambda a ́ \mu \eta$ through paluma ; cypressus $=\mathrm{Gr}$. кvтápıбооя through cuperes-
sus ; cervos = Gr. кєрaFós (horned); domui* for domävi, and similar perfects, $a$ being first weakened to $i$, and then this $i$ falling out, \&c.

Medial $e$ is lost between $b$ and $r$ in the suffixes $-b r a,-b r i s$, -brum, from R. fer $=$ Skr. bhar; between $p$ and $r$ in capri, supra beside supera (in Lucr.), infra beside infera, \&c.; between $t$ and $r$ in intra, contra, dextra beside dextera (-tra being the comparative suffix, Skr. -tara, Gr. - $\tau \varepsilon \rho o$, Osc. -toro, U. -tro); patris for pateris; habui for habēvi, and similar perfects, $\bar{e}$ having first passed through $i$, as in habitum ; repperi for repeperi ; rettuli for retetuli, \&c.

Medial $i$ is lost in caldus $=$ calidus (warm) ; soldus $=$ solidus ; valde $=$ valide ; cante (Carm. Saliar.) = canite ; nauta $=$ navita ; calx $=\mathrm{Gr} . \chi^{a \lambda i} \xi$; term. -mnus (in alumnus, vertumnus $)=-$ minus $($ in terminus, amamini $)=$ Gr. $-\mu \varepsilon \nu о \varsigma ~=S k r . ~$ -mânas; fertis $=$ feritis, fert $\dagger=$ ferit, volt $=$ volit, and similar verbal forms; dixti for dixisti, \&c. Under the later Empire we find such forms as fect, vixt, expensavt, \&c. 1 is often lost in the $i$-stems: thus we have primas for O. L. primatis ; sors beside sortis ; plebs for plebis, whence plebes ; scobs beside scobis, \&c. In consequence of this loss of $i$, the consonantal and the $i$-stems coincide in the form of nom. sing. Medial $i$, is lost before a consonant sometimes in Umbrian and Oscan, as in U. nōmne $=\mathrm{L}$. nomini, \&c. ; O. cevs = civis; U. fus $=\mathrm{O}$. fust $=\mathrm{L}$. fuerit ; U. habus $=\mathrm{O}$. hipust $=\mathrm{L}$. habuerit ; U. convortust $=\mathrm{L}$. converterit, \&c. Comparing U. habus, O. hipust with L. habessit, we see that the Umbrian and Oscan forms have lost two $i$ s, the $i$ of the perfect, and the conjunctive mark $i$. The perfect $-v i$ has completely disappeared in L. habessit ; and the only trace of it is found in the sharp $s$, written $s s$, while habuerint stands nearest to the original form habe-visint.

[^45]In nouns of the $o-$ stem, $o$ or $u$ ( $=$ I. E. $a$ ), is frequently lost before $s$ of the nom. sing. Thus we have puer for puers $=$ puerus ; vir for virs $=$ virus; famul (Enn. Ann.) beside famulus ; damnas for damnats beside damnatus ; Sallustis, Clodis, \&c. (on inscriptions), for Sallustius, \&c. Similarly we have O. U. pihaz $=$ L. piatus ; O. U. katel $=$ L. catulus ; N. U. termnas $=\mathrm{L}$. terminatus $; \mathrm{N} . \mathrm{U}$. tertis $=$ tertius, tertim $=$ tertium, just as in Old Latin alis, alid, = alius, aliud. We have also O. O. tuivtiks = L. tuticus, Pumpaiians = L. Pompeianus, hiurz = L. hortus, Heirennis $=$ L. Herennius, \&c. ; N. O. Bantins $=$ L. Bantinus.

Medial $u$ is also lost in stella for sterula ; ampulla for ampomula from ampora ; corolla for coronula from corona; misellus for miserulus ; lapillus for lapidulus from St. lapid; vinclum beside vinculum, \&c. Similarly we have in Umbrian Treblaneir = L. Trebulanis, vesclir $=$ L. vasculis, pihaclu $=$ L. piaculum, \&c., unless these be the original forms.

In Gothic we find $i$ and $u$ frequently omitted before a final $s$; thus we have vulfs (nom. sing. wolf) $=$ Skr. vrkas, and similar nominatives; brōthrs (gen. sing.) = I. E. bhrâtras, namins (gen. sing.) = L. nominis, \&c.

## §. 76. Insertion of a Vowel.

We find a vowel inserted in the following cases : drachuma (Plaut.) $=\delta \rho a \not \mu$ n, sumus for esumus $=$ Skr. smas, volumus for volmus, Tecumessa = Tecmessa, Hercules, AEsculapius, Patricoles, where the neighbourhood of $l$ or $m$ determines the inserted vowel to be $u$ or $o$; techina (Plaut.) $=\tau \varepsilon ́ \chi \nu \eta$, Procina, Ariadine, \&c., where the inserted vowel is $i$, on account of the neighbouring $n$; umerus $=$ Græc.-It. omsos beside Gr. $\check{\omega} \mu$ os, and Skr. $a \dot{m} s a$ (the shoulder), ruber for rubros $=$ Gr. ępv $\theta$ ós $=$ Skr. rudlira (blood, also with an inserted $i$ ), gener for genros $=$ Gr. $\gamma$ a $\mu-$ ß oós, caper = Gr. кáтроя, \&c., in all which forms $r$ determines the inserted vowel to be e. $\quad l$ is inserted in moriturus beside
mortuus, oriturus beside ortus, \&c. Similarly in Oscan we find between a liquid and a following consonant the vowel of the preceding syllable inserted, as in aragetud (abl. sing.) $=\mathrm{L}$. argento, teremnis $=$ L. terminus, \&c., just as in O.H. G. puruc for purc, Goth. baurgs, waram for warm, Goth. varms; and between a liquid and a preceding consonant the vowel of the following syllable is inserted, as in puturumpid gen. pl., utrorumque), pitiurispid (nom. pl. mas. utrique), pitereipid (loc. sing. masc.

## §. 77. The Gutturals.

$C$ and $q=$ I. E $k$ : acus, acer, acupedius, ocior, Skr. as'ri (the edge of a sword), âs'u (quick), Z. aku (a point) Gr. àk $\omega \kappa \mathfrak{k}$,
 E. halloo; cella, celo, domi-cilium, Skr. s'álâ (a house), Gr. ка-
 Hesych.), кєкáסovтo (Il. 15, 574), a redupl. aor. 2 of $\chi$ áदouaı from R. $\chi a \delta=\sigma \chi u \delta=$ I. E. skad; castus, Skr. s'udh (to purify), Gr. кaOa@ós, Ch. Sl. cistǔ (clean); cor, Skr. herd (heart), Gr. карסía; cerebrum, crista (in capite stans), Skr. s'iras (head), Gr. кáóo, кoavíov ; carpo, Gr. ка̣ло́s, E. larvest; civis = Osc. kevs, Skr. s'î (to lie), Gr. $\kappa \varepsilon \bar{\mu} \mu a t$, Goth. haims ( $\kappa \dot{\omega} \mu \eta$ ), heiva (domus), \&c.
$Q u=$ I. E. $k v: q u i n q u e=$ I. E. kvankvan, whence Skr. pañk'an (five), Gr. $\pi \notin \nu \tau \varepsilon$, Æol. $\pi \in \mu \pi \varepsilon$, Ir. coic, W. pump; quod $=$ I. E. kvad or kvat, whence Skr. kat, Gr. $\pi$ oũ, Ion. кoũ, E. what, \&c. In a few cases in Latin $k$ may have had $u$ developed after it, as in quies beside Skr. s'̂ (to lie), squalor beside Skr. kâla (black), and Gr. кغえaıvós, \&c. ; but in nearly all the cases where this development of $u$ is supposed to have taken place, it is much more probable that $k v$ had originally existed in Indo-European. In Old Umbrian we find $k$, and in New Umbrian $c$ and $q=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k$, except in the pronouns and numerals where $p$ takes the place of I. E. kv: O. U. kapres $=$ L. capri $;$ N. U. pequo $=$ L. pecua, \&c. This $k$ is
weakened to $\xi$ and $s$ before $e$ and $i,{ }^{*}$ as in N. U. curnaçe (abl. sing. of a noun corresponding to L. cornix) beside N. U. curnaco (acc. sing.) ; N. U. paçe and pase = L. pace, \&c. In Old Oscan $k$, and in New Oscan $c=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . k$, except that $p=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k v$ in the same cases as in Umbrian : O. O. likitud = licitud $=$ L. liceto ; O. O. sakaraklud (abl. sing.) beside L. sacellum, \&c. $C=$ I. E. $g$ in N. O. acum (inf.) beside L. ago. In Old Umbrian, as has been already remarked, $k$ represents L. $g$. $G=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . g:$ ago, igitur for agitur, Skr. ag'âmi (I go), Gr. $a ̈ \gamma \omega$, O. N. aka (ago); genus, $\dagger$ gigno (g)natura, Skr. g'an (to be born), $g^{\prime}$ anitâ (nom. sing. of St. g'anitar) = L. genitor, Gr.
 minate), O. H. G. chind (offspring) ; grus, $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\text {g.oavos, }}$, E. crane; gnosco, (g)notus, gnarus, (g)narrare, O. L. gnarigare, Skr. g'nâ (to know), Gr. $\gamma \iota \gamma \nu \omega \dot{\omega} \kappa \omega$, $\gamma \nu \omega \tau o ́ s, ~ O . ~ H . ~ G . ~ k n a ̄ u ~(I ~ k n o w), ~$ Goth. kann (I know), kunths (үvшбтós) whence E. uncouth;
 ( $\mathcal{\iota}(\omega \kappa \omega)$ ), A. S. vringan (stringere), E. wring, wrong ; genu $=$ Skr. g'ânu, Gr. yóvv, E. knee, \&c. In New Umbrian and Oscan, $g=$ I. E. $g$.
$G=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . k$ in a few words : digitus, Gr. סákтv $\begin{aligned} & \text { os, Goth. }\end{aligned}$ taihō (toe) ; viginti beside vicies, Skr. vins'ati, Gr. દ̌кобt, Bœot. Fíkaтı ; triginta, Gr. тоıáкоита ; gracilis beside O. L. cracentes (graciles), Skr. krs'a (thin), Gr. кодєкávos (long, lank), ко入о $\sigma^{-}$

* $K$ is retained in O. U. akeruniamem, N. U. acersoniem, O. U. kebu (cibo), and a few other cases; also in nominal stems of the $o$-declension that end in -ko, as N. U. Naharce (dat.), Tesenocir, (abl. pl.), except that we find $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. pupriģe beside puprike (publico), and pupriçes beside puprikes (publici). We find $\varsigma$ sometimes before $l$, as in O . U. tiçlu, ereģlu, \&c. Was this the beginning of that change which we see in Italian chiamare $=\mathrm{L} . \quad$ clamare, , chiaro $=\mathrm{L} . \quad$ clarus, occhio $=\mathrm{L} . \quad$ oculus, piano $=$ L. planus, piangere $=$ L. plangere, \&c.? $K$ is also found unaltered before $l$ in O . U. ehvelklu, fiklas, \&c.
+ There probably existed, in I. E. times, as a side form of R. gan, gvan, as we find Gr. $\gamma v \nu \dot{\eta}$, Bœot. $\beta a \nu \alpha ́$ for $\gamma F a v a$, Goth. gvêns ( $\theta \tilde{\eta} \lambda v_{\varsigma}$ ), E. quean, queen, and perhaps L. venter for gventer.

бós for кодокуоs; gubernator beside Gr. кข $\beta \varepsilon \rho \nu \eta$ йт $\quad$; Agrigentum* from Gr. 'Aкрáyas ; negotium = necotium ; pingo, Skr. pis' (to adorn), pês'alas = Gr. moıkídos ; ungulus, angulus beside uncus, ancus (qui aduncum brachium habet), Skr. aïkas (nom. sing. masc. the part above the hip), änkus'a (stimulus quo elephanti impelluntur), Gr. ö $\gamma \kappa$ оя (a curve), á $\boldsymbol{\gamma \kappa a ́}^{\prime} \lambda \eta$ (the (bent arm), ả $\boldsymbol{\kappa} \kappa \omega ́ \nu ;$ cygnия $=\mathrm{Gr}$. ки́кцоц; gurgulio = curculio ; ilignus from St. ilec; salignus from St. salic, Gr. غ́גíкך (the willow, in Arkadia) ; dignus connected by Curtius with decet, decus, Skr. das'as (glory), Gr. סoné $\omega$, but by others with Skr. dis $^{\prime}$ (to point out), Gr. סsíkvvuı; larignus from St. laric; langula (a little dish), from St. lanc; pango, pignus, beside paciscor, pax, Skr. and Z. pas' (to bind), Gr. $\pi \eta \gamma o ́ s ~(f a s t), ~ \pi \eta ́ \gamma \nu v \mu c, \pi a ́ \sigma \sigma a \lambda o s$
 from St. clovos-=clevos- = Gr. $\kappa \lambda$ éfos $-=$ Skr. s'ravas- (glory) from s'ru $^{\prime}=\mathrm{Gr} . \kappa \lambda v ;$ gummi $=\mathrm{Gr}$. ко́ $\mu \boldsymbol{\mu}$; gobius $=\kappa \omega \beta$ ıós ; and a few other cases. $\dagger$ In all these cases where $k$ is softened to $g$, it either begins a syllable or is in close proximity to $l$, $m, n$, or $r$.
$G=$ I. E. gh: fugio, I. E. blugh, Skr. bhug' (flectere) Gr. $\phi \varepsilon \dot{v} \gamma \omega$, Goth. biuga (ка́ $\mu \pi \tau \omega$ ) ; rigo, Gr. $\beta \rho \varepsilon ́ \chi \omega$, Goth. rign (rain) ; unguis, Skr. nakha (a nail), Gr. čvv $\xi$, from St. óvv $\chi$; fingo, figura, I. E. dhigh, Skr. dih (to smear), dêha (the body), Gr. $\theta \iota \gamma \gamma a ́ \nu \omega$, Goth. deiga ( $\pi \lambda a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega)$, O. H. G. teig (dough); ango, angustus, Skr. aihu (close), Gr. ä $\gamma \chi \omega$, ä $\chi o s$, Goth. aggvus (close) ; lingo, ligurio, Skr. lih and rih (to lick), Gr. $\lambda \varepsilon i \chi$ ${ }^{\omega}$, Goth. bilaigōn (ह̀mı入єí $\chi \iota \iota \nu)$; mingo, mejo, Skr. mih (mingere), Gr. ò $\mu \tau \chi$ '́ $\omega$; grando, suggrunda (eaves), Skr. hrâdunî (bad
 Sl. gradŭ (hail); gratus, O. and U. root her (to wish), Skr.

[^46]haryâmi (I love), Gr. ұápıs, ұaípw, Goth. faihu-gairns (greedy of money) ; \&c. In no case does an initial I. E. gh become L. $g$, except when succeeded by $r$, as in gratus, \&c., and perhaps by $l$, if Grassman be correct in deducing initial $g$ in glisco, glaber, and glubo, from an I. E. gh. In two cases fr appears to represent an I. E. ghr: frio, frico, Skr. ghar (to sprinkle), gharsh (to rub), Gr. $\chi$ @í $\boldsymbol{j}$; fragro a reduplicated form of R. $g r a=$ Skr. $g h r \hat{a}$ (odorari).

Schleicher considers that in some cases $u$ was developed after $g$, generally when a nasal, and sometimes when $r$ preceded, as in langueo beside Skr. lañg'â (a whore), Gr. גaya@ós (slack), $\lambda a ́ \gamma v o c$ (lustful), and urgueo beside urgeo, Skr. varg' (to exclude), so that $g u=$ I. E. $g$ or $g h$, and afterwards through assimilation of $g$ to $v, v$ alone remained, as in nivis for nigvis from nix. Now this development of $u$ after $g$ is extremely doubtful. In many cases $g u$ most probably existed in IndoEuropean times, in others $u$ is merely a suffix, while in others it seems to be inserted from a false analogy. Thus $u$ was a suffix, to which afterwards a secondary suffix $i$ was added, in pinguis beside Gr. $\pi a \chi^{v}{ }_{\mathbf{c}}$, brevis for bregvis, beside Gr. $\beta \rho a-$
 In the following cases we infer the existence of an I. E. $g u$ or ghu from the related words : voro for gvoro, I. E. gvar, whence gar (to devour), Gr. ßopá; vivus for gvigvus, a reduplication of I. E. gvi whence Skr. gîv (to live), Gr. ßios, E. quick. Again $u$ may have arisen from a false analogy in ninguit beside ningit and nivis for nigvis, gen. sing. of nix, from I. E. snigh, whence Gr.
 snaivs (snow); urgueo $=$ urgeo ; anguis beside Skr. ahis
 snake).
$H=$ I.E. gh: hospes, hostis, O. L. fostis, Ch. Sl. gostt (guest), Goth. gasts for gastis (a guest), Lith. gaspadà (hospitium); hěrus, hēres, O. L. hir (the hand), Skr. har (to seize), Gr. хвíp; heri, hes-ternus, Skr. hyas (yesterday), Gr. $\chi$ 0́s, O. H. G. gester (yesterday) ; hirundo, Gr. $\chi^{\varepsilon} \lambda \iota \delta o ́ \omega v$; hiems, hibernus, Skr.
hima (snow), Gr. $\chi \iota \omega \dot{\nu}, \chi \not \boldsymbol{\chi}^{\mu} \omega \dot{\nu}$; helus, helvus,* Skr. hari (green), Gr. $\chi$ 入ó, O. H. G. grōni (green); haruspex, hariolus, hira and hilla (entrails), Skr. hirâ (entrails), Gr. $\chi 0 \lambda a ́ \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$, хоро́n; hortus = Gr. хо́ртос; haedus, Gr. үоїта (Hesych. oĩ¢), Mod. Gr. үída, Goth. gaits (a goat); humus, Gr. $\chi a \mu a i ́ ~(a ~ l o-~$ cative from $\chi^{\alpha \mu \alpha}=\mathrm{I}$. E. ghamâ); homo (connected with humus), O. L. hemōnes (nom. pl.), Goth. guma from St. guman, whence -gam in G. Bräutigam (bridegroom) ; hio, Gr. रaì $\omega$, $\chi^{\text {áos, }} \chi^{\varepsilon} \neq a ́$ (a hole), O.N. gîn (I gape) ; prehendo for praehendo, hedera, praeda, perhaps for prahida, hasta, Skr. hasta (the hand)(?), Gr. $\chi^{a \nu \delta \dot{a} \nu \omega, ~ E . ~ g e t ~ ; ~ v e h o, ~ S k r . v a h ~(t o ~ c a r r y), ~ G r . o ̋ \chi o s ~}$ from R. $\mathrm{F}_{\chi}$, Goth. vigs (via); traho, perhaps connected with Skr. drâgh (adniti) and dhrâgh (posse), E. drag, which presuppose an I. E. dhragh. In the two last cases we have traces of the guttural in the perfects vexi and traxi for vegsi and trags. Gh passed through $f$ in becoming $h$, as we see from the Old Latin forms folus, fostis, fordus, \&c., for holus, hostis, hor$d u s$, \&c. Similarly in Spanish, $h$ represents L. $f$, as in $h i j o=$ filius, hablar $=$ fabulari, hierro $=$ ferrum .
$H=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . g h$ in Oscan and Umbrian, as O. herest, U. heriest (volet) beside Skr. haryâmi (amo), and Gr. xaíp $\omega$.
$H=I . E . b h$ in milhi, U. mehe, Skr. mahyam, beside tibi, Skr. tubhyam, and in horda beside forda (pregnant), from R. $f e r=$ Skr. bhar. Schleicher suggests that amavi for amafui, \&c., passed through the stage amahvi, \&c., and that the dat. pl. of the $a$-stems in $-\bar{\imath} s$ for -ais passed through the stage -ihis = I. E. -ablyyams, but these cases are extremely doubtful. Grassman considers that $h=b h$ in herctum or horctum. Festus tells us that horctum or forctum meant bonum ; and Grassmann considering that it meant originally "what is heaped up," connects it with Skr. bhrs'am (multum, valde), with

* Grassmann is mistaken in connecting L. gilvus with this root, for an initial I. E. gh followed by a vowel never becomes $g$ in Latin, but always $h$ through 0. L. $f$. Lottner agrees with Grassmann, and connects L. germen also with the same root.
which he also connects L. farcio, frequens. Curtius, on the other hand derives herctum, hercisco, from a root her lengthened
 hir, hĕrus.
$H$ appears to represent an I. E. $k$ in hic, from St. hi- = Goth. $h i-=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k i-$, and in habeo = Goth. haba (I have). Hic (for hice) may be a reduplicated form of $k i-$, the original $k$ perhaps appearing in the second syllable; compare citra, which may come from this root. Schleicher treats R. hab in habeo as a side form of R. cap in capio, and compares O. hipust (habuerit) and hafiest (habebit). He considers that $p$ is weakened to $b$ in habeo, just as in bibo, which he deduces from an I. E.pipâmi; this latter comparison is, however, extremely doubtful, as it is much more likely that the I. E. root began with $b h$, of which we still find a trace in Skr. pibâmi. $\quad H=$ I. E. $k$ in Skr. $h r d$ (heart) beside Gr. кa $\rho$ día, E. heart.
$H$ in Umbrian and Oscan not only corresponds to L. $h$, as in O. O. hurz = L. hortus, \&c., but it also takes the place of $c$ and $p$ before $t$, as in $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. scrēhto $=\mathrm{L} . ~ s c r i \bar{p} p t u m$, rehte $=\mathrm{L}$. recte, subahtu for subactu, and this again for subagtu $=\mathrm{L}$. subigito, O. O. ehtrad $=\mathrm{L}$. extra, saahtum $=\mathrm{L}$. sanctum, $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{O}$. Ohtavis $=$ L. Octavius, \&c. The long vowels in Umbrian are written, $a h a$ or $a h, \& c$.

Corssen considers that $h$ has sprung from $y$ in L. ahenue, beside Skr. ayas (iron); in Mahestinus (found on inscriptions) $=$ Majestinus ; and in O. U. pihaz, N. U. pihos = L. piatus, Volscian pihom $=\mathrm{L}$. pium, ${ }^{*}$ beside Skr. priya (carus). Hora is borrowed from Gr. $\check{\omega} \rho a$, which is connected with Z. yâre (year), E. year. If Pott is correct in treating hornus as $=$ ho-jor$n u s$, as biga $=b i j u g a$, we find in it the original Latin form corresponding to Z. yâre, and E. year. Hercules (O.Hereklo-) is also

[^47]borrowed from Gr. 'Heak ${ }^{\circ} \bar{\eta} s$; it has nothing to do with a Latin verb hercere, which cannot be $=$ Gr. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{!} \rho \kappa \varepsilon \iota \nu$, for Greek spiritus asper $=\mathrm{I}$. E. $s$; Mommsen erroneously connects the Greek and Latin verbs, and considers Hercules to be a Zeüs غ́ккёоц.

An inorganic $h$ is added to humerus for umerus, Gr. $\stackrel{\sim}{\omega} \mu \circ s$ $=$ Skr. ainsas (nom. sing. masc.), Goth. amsa, all of which forms point back to an I. E. amsas, whence came a Græco-It. omsos or omesos, of which latter form we find a trace in Gr. $\dot{a} \mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \omega$ (Hesych., the shoulder blades). Also humor = umor, connected by Curtius with Gr. viypós Skr. uksh (humectare). Similarly we find $h$ added in Sp. hedrar $=$ L. iterare, Fr. haut $=$ L. altus.

## §. 78. The Palatal $J$.

$J=$ I. E. $y:$ jecur, Skr. yakrt, and in the weak cases yakan
 Goth. juk, O. H. G. joch ; jus, Skr. yûsha (pease soup), Gr. گwhós (soup) ; juvenis, Skr. yuvan (young), E. young; jam, Goth. ju (now). Lith. jau (now) ; \&c.
I. E. $y$ is often vocalised in Latin: medius = Skr. mudhyas ; siem = Skr. syâm, Gr. દıخ $\eta \nu$ from I. E. asyâm ; \&c.

## §. 79. The Dentals.

$T=1$. E. $t$ : ante (for anted, an ablative form found in antidea), Skr. anti (before), Gr. àví; stella (for sterula), Skr. staras (the stars, in dial. Ved.), târâ (a star), Gr. à $\tau \tau \dot{\eta} \rho, \tau \varepsilon i \rho \varepsilon a$; et, at, in at-avus, Skr. ati- (ultra), Gr. ètı; vetus, Skr. vatsara (a year), Gr. ${ }^{\text {żros }}$; peto, penna, O. L. pesna for petna, Skr. pat (to fly), Gr. $\pi$ ह́roцaı; sto, Skr, sthâ, Gr. ï $\sigma \tau \eta \mu \iota$; sterno, torus for storus, Skr. star (sternere), Gr. $\sigma \tau \delta ́ \rho \nu v \mu \iota$; tendo, teneo,
 (I extend): tu, Skr. tvam (thou), Z. tûm (thou), Dor. тú, Bœot. тои́v, Goth. thu (thou) ; tuli, O. L. tulo, tetuli, Skr. tul (to lift), Gr. $\tau \lambda \tilde{\eta} \nu a \iota, \tau \varepsilon \lambda a \mu \dot{\omega} \nu, \tau a ́ \lambda a \varsigma ̧, ~ G o t h . ~ t h u l a ~(I ~ e n d u r e) ; ~$
termen, in-tra-re, trans, U. traf = L. trans, Skr. tar (to cross), Gr. $\tau \in \rho \mu a$, E. through, \&c.
$S t=$ I. E. $s k$ in stercus, Skr. s'akrt* (stercus), Gr. $\sigma \kappa \dot{\omega} \rho$ from
 A.S.skearn (dung); sturnus, Gr. $\neq$ á $\rho$ for $\sigma \pi \alpha \rho$, à $\sigma \tau \rho a \lambda$ ós (Hesych. ó $\psi$ a@òs vinò $\Theta \varepsilon \tau \tau a ́ \lambda \omega \nu)$, A. S. stearn, Bohem. skorec (a starling), where Curtius believes sk to be original, talpa for stalpa, Gr. $\sigma \pi a ́ \lambda a \xi, \sigma \kappa a ́ \lambda o \psi$ (a mole) ; talla (caepae putamen) is, according to Curtius, for stalla, and comes from an I. E. R. skal, whence G. schale (husk, rind), \&c.
$S t=$ I. E. $s p$ in studium, Gr. $\sigma \pi o v \delta$ 亿, E. speed ; turgeo for sturgeo, Gr. $\sigma \pi a \rho \gamma a ́ \omega, \sigma \phi \rho \iota \gamma a ́ \omega$ (I swell, burst), perhaps connected with $\sigma \phi$ ápayos (a noise), Skr. spurg' (to make a noise); and perhaps one or two other doubtful cases.
$T$ never $=$ I. E. $d h$ (except in the case of the initial group $t r$, as in traho). All the examples brought forward to prove the contrary can be easily explained without such a supposition. Thus, rutilus is for rudtilus, from R. rud = Skr. rudh, and -tilus is the same termination as is found in futilis, mutilus, \&c.; pati and Gr. $\pi a \theta \varepsilon i \imath \dagger$ are both independent formations from a root $p a, \pi a$, which bears the same rrelation to
 to $\gamma^{\varepsilon \nu}$ (in $\varepsilon \gamma^{\prime} \varepsilon \nu o ́ \mu \eta \nu$ ) and $\gamma o \nu$ (in $\gamma^{\xi} \gamma o \nu a$ ) and $\tau a$ (in $\tau a ́ \nu v \mu a \iota$ ) to $\tau \varepsilon \nu$ (in $\tau \varepsilon \dot{\prime} \nu \omega$ ); putāre is not connected with $\pi \breve{v} \theta \varepsilon ́ \sigma \theta a \iota$, for the latter comes from I. E. bhudh, whence Skr. budh (to know), and the former from L. putus (clean), beside Skr. ph (to clean), putare therefore signifying "to make clean" (compare amputare, lanam putare), and then "to make clear;" pūtēre and $\pi \bar{u} \theta \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ are independent formations from

* Bopp considers that $s^{\prime}$ in s'akrt represents an original $k$, and connects it with Gr. кóm $\rho \circ$ s for кoкроя, L. caco, \&c. Curtius connects кómpos with $\kappa a \pi \dot{v} \omega, \kappa \alpha \pi \nu o ́ s$, \&c. All the comparisons in this section and the succeeding one are extremely doubtful.
* Lottner and others, however, identify $t$ in lateo, patior, with $\theta$ in $\lambda a \theta \varepsilon \tau \nu, \pi \alpha \theta \tilde{\varepsilon} \nu$, and consequently infer the existence of the hard aspirates in Indo-European.
R. pū, connected with Skr. pûyê (putresco), Z. p̂̂ (to stink), and Goth. fuls (foul) ; the connexion of lateo with $\lambda a \theta \varepsilon i v$ is not so easily explained as the last examples, for we find Skr. rah (to leave), and rahas (a secret, or secretly), which point back to an I. E. radh, but it is likely that latere is formed from a R. la, as pūtere is from R. pu .
$D=$ I. E. $d$ : do, dăre, Skr. dâ (to give), Gr. $\delta i \delta \omega \mu$; dexter, Skr. dakshina (dexter), Gr. $\delta \varepsilon \xi \iota o ́ s, ~ G o t h . ~ t a i h s v o ̄ ~(~ \delta \varepsilon ~ \xi ~ t a ́) ; ~$ $d u o$, Skr. dva, Gr. סv́w, Goth. tvai ; domus, Gr. סómos, A. S. timber ; suadeo, suavis for suadvis, Skr. svad (to please), svâdus

$D=$ I. E. $t$ in quadraginta from quatuor.
$D=$ I. E. $d h:$ medius = Skr. madhyas, Gr. $\mu$ £́ $\sigma \sigma o s$ for $\mu \varepsilon \theta_{y o s}$, Goth. midjis (medius); aedes, aestus for aedtus, Skr. indh (to burn), Gr. ai $\theta \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \theta \eta$ (Hesych. $\varepsilon \dot{\jmath} \phi \rho o \sigma v ́ \nu \eta$ ), perhaps Aìrv and ${ }^{*} \mathrm{H} \phi$-ataros ; do in condo, credo, abdo is connected with Skr. $d h \hat{a}$ (to place) $=$ Z. $d \hat{a}$, Gr. $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$; vidua* = Skr. vidhavâ from vi- (without), and dhava (vir) ; \&c.
$D$ may be $=\mathrm{I}$. E. $y$ in tendo $=$ Gr. $\tau \varepsilon i \nu \omega$ for $\tau \varepsilon \nu y \omega$, Goth. thanja (I stretch); in fendo $=$ Gr. $\theta \varepsilon i \nu \omega$ for $\theta \varepsilon \nu y \omega$; and perhaps in the part. term. -endus or -undus = I. E. -anyas = Skr. -anîyas. In Zend we find the corresponding termination -énya in verezénya (working), from R. verez $=$ Gr. Fs $\rho \gamma$. In Oscan $n y$ perhaps became $n n$, as in O. O. upsannam $=\mathrm{L}$. operandam: in Umbrian also $n y$ became $n n$ or $n$, as double consonants are generally not both written in Umbrian, as in N. U. pihaner $=$ L. piandi (gen. sing.), \&c.
$D=G r . \lambda$ and $\rho$ in the two borrowed words, adeps and caduceus, from Gr. ä入єıфа and карv́кıоv. We also find $d$ for $l$ in Capitodium, a side-form of Capitolium, for Capitālium, $\bar{a}$ becoming $\bar{o}$ as in ignōro beside gnārus, \&c. Cadamitas, a side-form of calamitas, is generally supposed to be original, but it is much more likely that calamitas is the older form. Calamitas means "destruction of the calami;" thus we are

[^48]told (Serv. Verg. Georg. I. 151), Robigo, genus est vitii, quo culmi pereunt, quod a rusticanis calamitas dicitur. Calamitas is formed from St. calamo by means of the suffix-tat-, just as civitas is from St. civi, \&c. If on the other hand $d$ is original in this word, we would first have to form from cado, from which it is derived, the St. cadamo, but as the Romans never kept $a$ abefore the suffix $-m o$, but always changed it into $u$ or $i$, this supposed stem is foreign to the Latin, and most probably never existed. That $l$ sometimes became $d$ in vulgar Latin is shown by vodeba on an inscription at Pompeii for volebam.
$D$ in Old Umbrian, when initial, was represented by $t$, and in New Umbrian by $d$; when medial or final it was in Old Umbrian changed into a sonant hissing sound, represented by q ( $\underset{\sim}{r}$ ), which in New Umbrian became rs. Thus we have N. U. $d u r=\mathrm{L} . d u o$; N. U. dupursus (bipedibus) from purs- $=\mathrm{L}$. ped-; O. U. asam-ar = L. aram-ad (ad aram); O. U. arveitu $=\mathrm{L}$. advehito ; N. U. virseto $=\mathrm{L}$. visus from R. vid; $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. pere, piri, N. U. perse, pirst $=\mathrm{L}$. quid, with the same $\bar{\imath}$ attached as is found in Gr. - (ovirooí) compare Lith. -ai (tas-aí) ; O. U. tera, N. U. dersa $=$ didat (det), a reduplicated form of R. da, \&c. We find $r$ for initial $d$ in $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. rere $=\mathrm{L}$. dedit ( 3 sing. perf.) and runum $=\mathrm{L}$. donum, but these forms may be, as Schleicher suggests, only dialectic.

In Oscan $d=\mathrm{L} . d$; it is also retained in some cases where $l$ is found in Latin. Thus we have O. O. puid, N. O. pod = L. quod, O. O. pid = L. quid ; N. O. deicans ( 3 pl conj. pres.) $=\mathrm{L}$. dicant ; O. O. dedet $=\mathrm{L}$. dedit ; O. O. Akudunniad $=\mathrm{L}$. Aquiloniā(d).
$R=$ I. E. $r:$ aro, Gr. á $\rho o ́ w$, Goth. arjan (to plough); orior, Skr. ar (to move), ârta = Gr. $\tilde{\omega} \rho \tau о$, Gr. ő $\rho v v \mu \iota$; rivus, Rumo, (the old name of the Tiber), Skr. sru (to flow), Gr. $\rho^{\prime} \notin \omega$; fero, Skr. bhar, Gr. фf́p $\omega$; ruber, Skr. rudhiram (nom. neut. blood) ; $-t o r,-t e r,=$ Skr. $-t \hat{a} r-t a r$, as dator $=$ Skr. dât $\hat{a}$ for $d \hat{a} t \hat{a} r s$, pater $=$ Skr. pitâ for patars ; rēs $=$ Skr. râs (divitiae) from St. râi ; \&c.
$R=\mathrm{I}$. E. $d$ in arbiter for ad-biter and arcesso. In Old Latin $r$ is frequently found for $d$, as in arvenas (Prisc. I. 45), for advenas, arvorsum (Sc. de Bacc.) for advorsum, arfuisse (Sc. de Bacc.) for adfuisse, \&c. Even apor and ar were used for apud and ad. This is similar to the change of $d$ into $r$ in Old Umbrian.

The Latin language, however, afterwards recovered itself from this weakening of $d$ to $r$, and restored $d$, except in arcesso, arbiter, and meridies where $r=d=\mathrm{I}$. E. $d h$ as medius $=$ Skr. madhyas. $\quad R$ in mirus is not developed from $d$, as is asserted by those who look upon $r$ as belonging to the root, and compare it with Gr. $\mu \varepsilon \delta_{\delta} \delta^{\omega} \omega$, but -ro is a suffix, found also in clarus, \&c., and $d$ does not belong to the root in $\mu \varepsilon \delta \delta a ́ \omega$; these words are probably independent formations from the I. E. R. $s m i=$ Skr. smi (to laugh), whence also O. H. G. smielen, smieren, (to laugh), E. smile, Lett. smeet (to laugh).
$R=$ an older $n$ in crepusculum, creperus (dubius), beside Gr. к $\nu^{\ell} \notin a s ;$ groma borrowed from Gr. $\gamma \nu \omega \prime \mu \omega \nu$. Leo Meyer also derives germen from R. gen, and carmen from R. can; but in both cases he is entirely wrong. Curtius connects germen with Skr. garbha (uterus, foetus), Z. garewa (foetus),
 whence Skr. grah (capere) ; germen would therefore be for gerbmen. Carmen is for casmen, compare Casmenae. We find $r$ representing an older $n$ in Fr. diacre (= diaconus), Londres, ordre (= ordinem); Sp. hombre (= hominem), fembra (= femina), \&c. Conversely in Wall. suspina $=$ suspirare we find $n$ for $r$. It is a mistake to identify the $n$ - with the $r$ suffixes in $\tilde{v} \delta \omega \rho$ beside Skr. udan (water); in L. jecur, Gr. $\eta ँ \pi a \rho$, Skr. yakrt beside Skr. yakan (from which the weak cases of yakrt are formed), Lett. aknis (the liver); in Skr. s'akrt, Gr. $\sigma \kappa \omega$ ' $\rho$, L. stercus, stercor-is beside Skr. s'akan (from which the weak cases of s'akrt are formed), for we frequently find these suffixes coexisting in the same language,
and sometimes in the same word: thus, we have Gr. viduns (watery) beside $\boldsymbol{v} \delta \omega \rho$, the former word being formed from R. $v \delta$ by means of the suffix $-v a$; in L. jecinoris, gen. sing. of jecur, we find both suffixes coexistent; and similarly we find both in A. S. skearn (dung) $=\sigma \kappa \kappa \omega^{\rho} \rho$ and A. S. stearn $=$ L. sturnus. $L=$ I. E. $r$ : loquor, Skr. lap (to speak), Gr. ह̀ $\lambda$ ăкоv, Ch. Sl. reka (to speak); linguo Skr. rik' (to separate), Gr. $\lambda \varepsilon i \pi \omega$; luceo, 'Skr. ruk' (to shine), Gr. גєvкós, $\lambda$ v́ $\chi$ vos ; sollus = Skr. sarvas (all); culter, cultus, Skr. kartar̂̀ (shears), Gr. кєị $\omega$; plēnus $=$ Skr. pūrnas (full); lacero, Gr. 入áкоя, ค́áкоя, Æ્ol. $\beta_{\varrho}$ а́коя from R. F $\rho$ ак $=$ Skr. vras'k' (scindere) ; latus for platus beside Skr. prath (extendere) ; gallus for garlus beside garrio, Skr. gar (to call), Gr. $\gamma$ ñpvs; gula, gur-gul-io beside gurges, (g)voro, Skr. gar (to swallow) ; volo, Skr. var (to choose); vulgus, Skr. vargas (nom. sing. masc. a multitude); vellus, Skr. ûrnâ (wool), Gr. ępoov, Ion. हĩpos, \&c.

$$
L=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . l: \text { see § } 21 .
$$

$L=$ I. E. d: lacrima, O. L. dacruma, Gr. Sák $\rho v$, Goth. tagr, O. H. G. zahar ; levir, Skr. dêvar (husband's brother), Gr. $\delta a \eta \not \rho, ~ A . ~ S . ~ t a ̄ c o r, ~ O . ~ H . ~ G . ~ z e i h h u r ; ~ l i n g u a, ~ O . ~ L . ~ d i n g u a, ~$ Goth. tuggō, O. H. G zunga; impelimenta (in Festus) = impedimenta ; ol-facio, oleo beside odor, Gr. ő $\omega_{\omega}=$ ó $\delta y \omega$, ő $\delta \omega \delta$; ; lautia (entertainment) beside dautia, which Aufrecht connects with Skr. dûta (nuntius); Ulixes = 'O num connected by Bopp with dah (to burn), Gr. 入ıyvús (thick smoke mixed with flame); but Curtius prefers to follow Jos. Scaliger in deriving it from legere (to gather), whence legumen, \&c., lignum would then mean "a bundle of sticks;" limpidus connected by Bopp with Skr. dîp (to shine), but by Curtius with Gr. $\lambda a ́ \mu \pi \omega$, "O $\lambda \nu \mu \pi$ os; lacero connected by Bopp with Skr. dañs' (to bite), Gr. סáкv $\omega$, but much more probably from R. lac = Gr. Fpaк; pol-lingo, lino beside Skr. dih (to smear); larva (a mask) connected with Skr. dars' (to see), Gr. ס£́ $\kappa \omega$; laurus for daurus, Skr. druma (a tree), dâru (wood), Gr. סৎũs, סópv ; -ilius (in Popi-
lius, \&c.) $=$ idius* $^{*}$ (in Popidius, \&c.) ; delicare beside dedicare, -sul (in consul, \&c.) is generally connected with R. sed, whence sĕdeo, sella for sedla, sēdes, solium, but Mommsen connects it with salire, and Corrsen with Skr. sar (to go). In Oscan we find $d$ kept between vowels, where in Latin $l$ is found, as in O. O. Akudunniad = L. Aquiloniā (d), O. U. Akeruniam-em, N. U. Acersoniam-e (in Aquiloniam), the modern Acedogna.
$L$ appears to represent an I. E. $n$ in a few cases: lendes for clendes beside Gr. кovídes (eggs of lice, nits), A. S. hnit, Lith. glindas, for no word in Latin can begin with cn ; pulmo beside $\pi \nu \varepsilon \dot{v} \mu \omega \nu$. For a similar change in other languages consult §54. Although L. alius, Gr. ä $\lambda \lambda$ os, Goth. alis (ä $\lambda \lambda$ os) are generally connected with Skr. anya (another), it is more likely that there were originally two independent pronominal stems, al and an; from the former of which came L. alius, \&c.; and from the latter Skr. anya, Gr. èvıoı, Goth. anthar (ä $\lambda \lambda \frac{1}{}$ ), Ch. Sl. inŭ (alius). Pulmo and lendes appear therefore to be the only Latin words where $l=$ I. E. $n$. The opposite change never occurs in Latin, though it does sometimes in Greek, as
 chest) $=\lambda a ́ \rho \nu a \xi$.
$S=$ I. E. $s:$ sum, est, Skr. asmi (sum), asti (est), Gr.
 Sl. jesmř, jestг ; uro, ustus from R. us = Skr. ush (to burn), Gr. $\varepsilon \nu ้ \omega ;$ septem $=$ Skr. saptan, Gr. $\varepsilon \in \tau \grave{a} ;$ sto, R. sta $=$ Skr. sthâ (to stand), from I. E. sto; $-s$ (term. of nom. sing.) $=\mathrm{I}$. E. $-s$, as in equus $=$ Skr. as'vas $=$ Gr. $i \pi \pi$ os, \&c.; O. L. sum

* As we find O. U. famerias, karitu, Pumperias beside L. familia, calare, Pompilia, it hasbeen suggested (Die Umbrischen Sparchdenkmäler von S. Th. Aufrecht und A. Kirchhoff, p. 84) that the original forms of these words had $d$ in place of $r$ and $l$, as O. U. $r=$ I. E. $d$. I cannot assent to this view as far as relates to familia and calare, for $f a-$ milia is from famulus, which is formed from a St. fama, as humilis, from St. humo, and calare is connected with Gr. ка入є́ $\omega$, G. hallen. $R$ was, perhaps, written for $r$ by a mistake of the stone-cutter in these two cases.
(him), sam (her), Skr. $s a, s \hat{a}=$ Gr. $\dot{\delta}, \dot{\eta}, \& c . \quad S$ is retained in Umbrian and Oscan, where it is found in the corresponding Latin words, and also in other cases where it is either lost or changed into $r$ in Latin. Thus we have O. U. tutas Ijuvinas (gen. sing.) = L. totos Iguvince, kaprēs, katlēs = L. capri, catuli, O. O. pümpaiianers $=$ pompeiani, N. O. eituās (gen. sing. pecunice). The $a$-stems in Oscan and Old Umbrian still retain the final $s$ in the nom. pl.: O. O. Nüvlanus $=$ L. Nolani, N. O. pas, scriftas $=$ L. quce, scripte, O. U. urtas $=$ L. ortoe. In New Umbrian this final $s$ has generally become $r$; screihtor (nom. pl.) $=$ L. scripti, totcor (nom. pl.) = L. tutici, motar (nom. pl.) $=$ L. multce (pœnæ), totar (gen. sing.) = L. totce, popler (gen. sing.) $=$ L. populi. In New Umbrian final $s$ is still kept in the dat. and abl. pl. of the $i$-stems, as in aveis $=$ L. avibus. In Old Umbrian and Old Oscan the change of final $s$ into $r$ had already begun in the passive voice, as $0 . \mathrm{U}$. emantur $=$ R. emantur, O. O. sakarater $=$ L. sacratur, \&c. S is generally kept between two vowels in Oscan and Umbrian, as in U. asa = L. ara, O. O. aasas = L. arce. In Oscan $s$ became a sonant $s$, represented by $z$, between two vowels in certain cases, as in - azum (term. of gen. pl.) $=\mathrm{L} .-\operatorname{arum}=\mathrm{I}$. E. - $\hat{a} s \hat{a} m$, censazet for censasent (censebunt), \&c. Final $t s$ was represented by $\approx$ in Old Umbrian and Old Oscan, and by $s$ in New Umbrian, as O. U. pihaz $=\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{U}$. pihos $=\mathrm{L}$. piatus, O. O. hurz $=\mathrm{L}$. hortus, \&c. In Umbrian an original $k$ is generally weakened to a sibilant before $e$ and $i$, as in pase $=\mathrm{L}$. pace, desenduf $=\mathrm{L} . d u o d e c e m, ~ c ̧ e s n a ~=~ L . ~ c e n a, ~ \& c . ~$
$N=$ I. E. $n:$ in- (neg. prefix), Skr. and Z. an-, $a-$, Gr. $\dot{a} \nu-, \dot{a}-, \mathrm{O}$. and U. an-, $a-$; inter, indu, Skr. antar (within), Gr. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \nu \delta o \nu,{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \nu \tau \varepsilon \rho o v, ~ O . ~ U . ~ a n t e r, ~ N . ~ U . ~ a n d e r ~ ; ~ m e n s, ~ m a n e o, ~$ Skr. and Z. man (to think), Gr. $\mu \varepsilon ́ \nu \omega, \mu \notin \nu o s ; ~ n a v i s, ~ S k r . ~$ nâus $=$ Gr. vaüs; novus, Skr. navas $=$ Gr. véFos, O. O. Nüvla; $n e$, non, Skr. and Z. na (not), Gr. $\nu \eta-=$ Ved. nâ; term. no(in plenus, somnus, \&c.) = Skr. na- (in pûrna, \&c.); term. men (in nomen), \&c.) = Skr. man (in nâman, \&c.) ; \&c.
$N=$ I. E. $m$ in a few cases : nonus for novimus from novem, as decimus from decem, \&c.; gener for gemer beside Gr. $\gamma a \mu-$ ßoós, although it may come directly from R. gen (to produce); tenebrce beside Skr. tamisra (darkness), O. S. thim (dim), O. H. G. demar (crepusculum), Ir. temel (dark). Some writers consider that $n=m$ in venio beside Skr. gam (to go), janitrix beside Skr. g'âmâtar and yâmâtar (gener), and aeneus $=$ Skr. ayasmayas (ferreus), but these comparisons are extremely unlikely : consult $\S .54$.


## §. 80. The Labials.

$P=$ I. E. $p:$ super, Skr. upari (above), Gr. $\dot{v} \pi!\rho$, Goth. ufar (over) ; plus, plerique, Skr. puru (much), Gr. $\pi$ odús, Goth. filu ( $\pi \mathbf{\pi} \lambda \dot{\prime} \tilde{s}_{)}$; potis, potior, potens, Skr. pati (a master), Gr. $\pi$ ó $\sigma \iota$; pluit, pluvia, Skr. plu (to swim), Gr. $\pi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega, \pi \lambda \dot{v} \nu \omega$, O. H.G. fiozan (to flow) ; pons, Skr. patha (a way), Gr. $\pi a ́ t o s, ~$ O. N. fatt (ibam) ; per, O. perum (outside), Skr. parâ (away, Z. para (outside), Gr. $\pi a \rho a ́, ~ G o t h . ~ f r a-; ~ p o r t a, ~ e x-p e r-i o r, ~$ Skr. par (to cross), Z. par (to bring over), Grr: $\pi o ́ \rho o s, \pi \varepsilon \rho a ́ \omega$, Goth. faran (to go); serpo, Skr. sarp (to creep), Gr. ${ }_{\xi}^{\prime \prime} \rho \pi \omega$; \&c.
$P$ perhaps represents an I. E. $b h$ in potus; consult $\S .55$.
$S p$ in Latin has in no case been developed from an older st. Spica and spiculum are not connected with Gr. $\sigma \tau$ áx $\mathbf{v}$, but rather with O. N. spiot (hasta), G. spies (a spear), spitze (a point); perhaps Gr. $\pi \iota \kappa \rho o ́ s ~ a n d ~ e ̀ \chi \varepsilon \pi \varepsilon v \kappa \eta ́ s ~(p o i n t e d) ~ b e l o n g ~ t o ~$ the same root. Spatium = Æol. $\sigma \pi a ́ \mathrm{C} \iota \circ \nu$ is connected with Gr. $\sigma \pi \dot{a} \omega$, O. H. G. spannan, and Gr. $\sigma \tau a ́ \delta \iota o v$ is a later form. $S p u o$ is connected with Gr. $\pi \tau v \dot{\omega}, \mathrm{~L}$. pituita, Goth. speiva(spuo), Lith. spjauju (spuo). We find $\sigma \pi=$ an original $\sigma \tau$ in Æol. $\sigma \pi о \lambda \dot{a}=\sigma \tau о \lambda \dot{\eta}, \kappa a \sigma \pi о \lambda \varepsilon ́ \omega=\kappa a \tau a \sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda \tilde{\omega}$, where $\sigma \tau$ is original, as we see from L. praestolor, O. H. G. stellan (to place), E. stall. We also find Goth. sparva, O. H. G. sparo beside Gr.
$\sigma \tau \varrho o v ̃ \theta o s$. We find $s p$ beside Gr. $\sigma \kappa$ in spolium beside Gr. $\sigma \kappa \tilde{v} \lambda o v$, where $\sigma \kappa$ is original. We also find specio, specto beside Gr. $\sigma \kappa$ ย́птоцає for $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \kappa \tau о \mu a \iota$ from I. E. spak, whence Z. $s^{\prime} p a s^{\prime \prime}$ (to behold), Skr. pas' (to see), E. spy.

In Umbrian and Oscan $p=$ I. E. $k v$ and L. $q u$ in the pronouns and numerals and words derived from them, and perhaps, in some other cases. Thus we have O. U. and N. U. pis = L. quis, O. O. puid, N. O. pod, = L. quod, N. O. pomtis = quinque, N. U. peturpursus = L. quadrupedibus, N. U. panta $=$ L. quanta, \&c. Hence when we find $p=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k v$ in any Latin word, we may infer that that word is borrowed from either Umbrian, Oscan, or Sabine. Corssen* believes that $p$ has been developed from an I. E. $k v$ within the limits of the Latin language; but the examples by which he supports this view are either extremely doubtful or susceptible of another explanation. Curtius $\dagger$ also asserts that L. $p$ has arisen from an Older $k$ in sapio, lupus, Epona, trepit, and scepio, comparing these words with sucus, Gr. $\lambda$ úкоs, equus, torqueo, and Gr. $\sigma \eta \kappa$ ós. Now sapio has nothing to say to sucus, but is connected with $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{H} . \mathrm{G} . \operatorname{sab}$ (to understand), whence antseffan (Præt. ant-suob), and Gr. $\sigma o \phi o ́ s ~ a n d ~ \sigma a \phi \eta ́ s, ~ w h e r e ~ \phi ~ r e-~$ presents an older $\pi$; lupus is most probably a Sabine word, but Schleicher connects it with Z. urupis, raopis (a kind of dog), and derives it from R. rup or lup (to tear) ; saepio does not agree with $\sigma \eta \kappa$ ós in the vowel of the root for Gr. $\eta=$ I. E. $\hat{a}$ and L. $a e=$ I. E. $a i$; Epona is a Keltic term; trepit (vertit) and Gr. $\tau \rho \varepsilon ́ \pi \omega$ are, perhaps, formed from a root tar by the suffix $p$, and torqueo from same root by the addition of a different suffix. Corssen adds to these examples popina, palumbus, opinari, comparing them with coquina, columba, and Gr. o้ $\sigma \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta a \iota$ for òкyєб $\theta a \iota$. Now popina and palumbus are most likely borrowed words, as we have beside them the genuine Latin form, coquina and columba, just as we have Osc. Поит-

[^49]$\tau \operatorname{los}=$ L. Quinctius beside L. Pompejus (borrowed from Oscan) and Petrejus from Osc. petora (four). The connexion of opinari with o$\sigma \sigma \varepsilon \sigma \theta a t$ is very doubtful; Curtius assents to Crain's suggestion that an initial $k v$ has been lost, and that it comes from the same root as Gr. кađív, L. vapor for kvapor, Lith. kvapas (smoke). Limpidus is considered by Schleicher to be a dialectic form of liquidus; Bopp, however, connects the former with Skr. $d \hat{p} p$ (to shine), Gr. $\lambda$ á $\mu \pi \omega$, and the latter with Skr. $l \hat{\text { ind }}$ (liquefacere). Curtius connects liquêre, liquidus with Skr. rik' (to separate), Z. ric (to leave, to pour out), L. lin$q u o, \& c$.
$B=$ I. E. b in brevis for bregvis beside Gr. $\beta \rho a \chi$ ús, and labi beside Skr. lamb (to fall), and a few imitative words: consult §. 22.
$B=$ I. E. gv: be-tere, ar-bi-ter, venio for gvenio, N. U. benust $=0$. U. benus ( 3 sing. fut. ex.) from R. ben (to come), Skr. gâ (to go), Goth. quiman (to come); bos, Skr. gâus (nom.
 chuo (cow) ; bovare, re-boare, Skr. gu (to sound), Gr. ßoí, $\beta$ oá $\omega$, $\gamma$ óos, $\gamma$ oá $\omega$, $\gamma$ óvs; super-bus, Skr. g'i (to conquer), Gr. ${ }^{\boldsymbol{v} \pi} \boldsymbol{\epsilon} \rho \beta$ oos, from I. E. gvi, whence, perhaps, also come Gr. Fís,
 with Skr. gval (flammare).
$B=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . b h^{*}$ (when medial) : amb-, Skr. ablhi (towards), Gr. à $\mu \dot{\prime}$, O. S. umbi, O. H. G. umpi; ambo, Skr. ubhâu (both), Gr. ä $\mu \phi \omega$, Goth. bai (both); nubes, nebula, Skr. nabhas (aer, coelum), Gr. vépos ; umbilicus, Skr. nâbhi (the navel), Gr. òдфа入ós; orbus, Gr. ò pфavós; labor, Skr. rabh (desiderare), Gr. $\eta \boldsymbol{\eta} \lambda \phi o v(\mathrm{I}$ acquired), $\dot{a} \lambda \phi \eta \sigma \tau$ ís, Goth. arbaiths (toil); -brum (in candelabrum, \&c.) from I. E. bhar $=$ Skr. bhar (to carry); imber, Skr. ambhas (water), abhra (clouds), Gr. ő $\mu \beta \rho$ os ; -bus

[^50](term. of dat. pl.) = Skr. -bhyas; -bam, -bo (in amabam, amabo, \&c.) for -fuam, -fuo from I. E. bhû (to be); \&c.
$B$ is never $=\mathrm{I}$. E. $b h$ (when initial), except in bibo, respecting which consult §. 55. Bopp indeed connects bacca* with Skr. bhaksh (to eat), and suggests that bucca comes from the same root, unless it belongs to Skr. mukha (the face)! He also connects brachium with Skr. bâhu (the arm), Gr. $\pi \tilde{\eta} \chi v s$, I. E. bhâghu. These examples are, however, so doubtful that we cannot conclude that L. $b$ is ever $=$ I. E. $b h$, except in $b i b o$.
$B=$ I. E. $d h$ (when medial) : ruber, robigo, Skr. rudhira (blood) ; uber for ouber, Skr. udhas (uber), Gr. oũ $\theta a \rho$, O. H.G. ūtar, A. S. ūder; uber (rich) for oiber, Skr. êdhatê (he increases), from R. idh; verbum, U. verfale (= verbale), Goth. vaurd (a word), G. wort, Lith. vàrdas (a name); barba, G. bart, E. beard; robur, connected by some with Skr. râdh (perficere), but by Bopp with Skr. ruh (crescere) for rudh. Other examples of this change have been adduced, but in each case a better explanation of the L. $b$ can be given: liber has nothing to say to Gr. $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon u ́ \theta \varepsilon \rho o ́ s$, for we find O. L. loebesom $=$ liberum, which is connected with Skr. lubh (to desire), Gr. $\lambda_{i} \psi(\dot{\psi} \pi \iota \theta \nu \mu i a$, Hesych.), $\lambda i \pi \tau о \mu a \iota$, Goth. liubs (loved), while the old derivation of $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \theta \varepsilon \rho o s, \pi a \rho ̣ a ̀ \tau o ̀ ~ z ̇ \lambda \varepsilon u ́ \theta \varepsilon \iota \nu$ öтou $\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \tilde{a}$, is probably correct; plebes and Gr. $\pi \lambda \tilde{\eta} \theta$ os are independent formations from the root par (to fill), and L. $b$ is not Gr. $\theta$ here; urbs is not connected with Skr. ardha, for the latter meant originally half, and then it came to mean side, as G. halbe means both half and side; the term. -brum should

[^51]not be identified with Gr. ${ }^{\underline{8}}-\theta \rho o \nu$, for the latter was originally $-\tau \rho o \nu$ and the former belongs to Skr. bhar (to bear). Libra is, perhaps, borrowed from $\lambda^{i} \rho \rho a$ (for $\tau \lambda_{\iota \tau} \rho a$ beside $\tau \lambda a ́ \omega$, as L. latus for tlatus) through $\lambda_{i} \theta \rho a$, or else $\lambda_{i t \rho} \rho a$ is borrowed from libra, the term -bra being connected with Skr. bhar (to bear).
$B$ is never = I. E. gh. The only example adduced in proof of this change is bilis, which is wrongly connected with Gr. $\chi$ ódos, $\chi$ o $\lambda \dot{\eta}$ (gall, anger), O. H. G. galla (gall). L. fel, fell-is, is the true Latin representative of $\chi$ ó $\lambda_{o c ̧}$.
$B=$ I. E. $d v: b i n i, b i s$, Skr. $d v a$ (two), dvis (twice), Z. $d v a$ (two), bi- (two, in composition), Gr. סv́o, סíc, סev́тєpos by metathesis from dvataras, L. duo, dis-; bi- occurs several times in composition, as in bivira (noticed by Varro in the sense of widow), bipes, St. biped = Skr. dvipad (a man), bīmus $=b i-h i m u s$ (according to Aufrecht) from bi- and himo- = Z hima (a year) connected with Skr. hima (snow), L. hiems, but $=l i$-smus (according to Bopp) from bi- and smo- connected with Skr. samâ (a year) ; bellum=duellum; Bellius $=$ Duellius, bonus beside duonoro (t. Scip. Barb. f.) = bonorum.
$B=$ I. E. $m$ in blandus for mlandus, a participial form of a R. $m l \bar{a}$, the original form of which was probably marl, which is found in Skr. $m r d$ (exhilarare), Gr. $\mu \varepsilon_{i} \lambda_{l} a$ (propitiatory gifts), E. mil-d. This is the only example of this change that has been adduced. It is better, however, to suppose that blandus came from mlandus through the step mblandus, as Gr. $\beta \rho о т$ о́s $=\mu \beta$ оотоя $=\mu \rho о т о \varsigma$, than to suppose that $b$ immediately represented $m$.
$B$ (according to Bopp) represents Skr. $v$ in -ber (September, \&c.) beside Skr. vâra (time), and in balneum beside Skr. bâd (lavare). This latter comparison is certainly wrong, for balneum is borrowed from Gr. $\beta a \lambda a v \varepsilon i o v$, which was derived from ßádavos (an acorn), on account of the similarity of their shapes, and the Skr. bâd is a very obscure word.
$B=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . p$ (when final) : $a b$, Skr. apa (away), Gr. $\boldsymbol{a} \pi \boldsymbol{o}^{\prime}$,

Goth. af, O. H. G. $a b a$; ob (which originally meant the same as ad, as in obviam, obire, opportunus), Skr. api (used as an adverb $=$ also, and as a prefix $=a f t e r$, as in apig'as $=\dot{\varepsilon} \pi i \neq \nu o v o s)$,
 (sub), O. H. G. oba (super). $B=\mathrm{Gr} . \pi$ in some borrowed words, as Burrus $=\Pi$ и́ $\rho \dot{\rho}$ os,, carbasus $=\kappa$ ́́ $\rho \pi a \sigma o \varsigma, b u x u s ~=\pi \dot{u} \xi_{o s}$ Buxentum from $\Pi v \xi_{o v ̃ s . ~}^{\text {s. }}$
$F=$ I. E. bh: fari, fatum, fax, facies, favilla, Skr. bhâ (to shine), blâsh (to speak), Gr. $\phi \eta \mu i, \phi$ aiv $\omega$, фáos; forare, Z. bar (to bore), Gr. фápos (a plough), фápay $\xi$ (a ravine), O.H.G. poran (to bore), E. bore ; fero, fordus, far, Skr. bhar (to bear), Z. bar (to bear), Gr. ф́ध $\omega$, E.bear ; flare, flos, Gr. єє $\varnothing \lambda a i ̀ \omega$ (I flow out), $\phi \lambda \boldsymbol{a}-\sigma \mu$ ós (bubbling, boasting), O. H. G. blāan, (to blow), blatara (pustule), bluojan (florere), Goth. blöma (bloom), blöth (blood); fui, Skr. blĥ (to be), Gr. фv́ $\omega$, E. be; fugio, I. E. bhugh, Skr. bhug' (to bend), Gr. $\phi \varepsilon$ v́ $\omega$, Goth. biuga (I bend); fagus, Gr. фทүós, E. beech ; fulgeo, fulvus, Skr. bhrâg' (to shine), Gr. $\phi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega$, E. bright; fremere, frětum, Frentani, Skr. bhram (to whirl), Gr. $\beta \varrho \notin \mu \omega$, $\beta_{\varrho о \nu \tau}$ и, O. N. brim (the surge); furvus, and fuscus, perhaps for fur-scus, as Tuscus for Turscus, Skr. babhru (red, and the ichneumon), Gr. $\phi \varrho$ úv $\quad$ (the toad, from its colour), E. brown; findere, Skr. bhid (to cleave), E. bite, \&c. A medial $f(=\mathrm{I}$. E. bh) between two vowels is only found in such compounds as signifer, \&c.; and in scrofa (a sow), Gr. ypouфás (a sow), so called from its rooting, connected with $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega, \gamma \rho \circ \phi \varepsilon i ̈ s ~(\zeta \omega \gamma \rho a ́ \phi o l, ~$ Hesych.), Goth. graba (I dig), L. scrobs; \&c. In Oscan and Umbrian we not only find $f=$ initial $f$ in Latin, but also $f$ $=$ medial L. $b: \mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U} . t e f e$, ife $=\mathrm{L} . t i b i, i b i ; ~ O . U . t r i f o r=\mathrm{L}$. tribus; O. U. prufe $=$ L. probe, Skr. prabhâva (excelsus) (?); O. O. $p u f=$ L. $u b i ;$ O. O. sifei $=$ L. sibi; N. O. amprufid $=$ L. improbe, \&c.
$F=$ I. E. dh: of-fendo, Gr. $\theta \varepsilon i \nu \omega$; festus, feriae, Gr.
 ратоs; famulus, Skr. dhâ (to place), Gr. тít $\quad$; femina, filius
 mas（smoke），Gr．Ov uós，\＆c．A medial $f(=\mathrm{I}$ ．E．dh）between two vowels is only found in rufus，Gr．épu是oós．In Oscan and Umbrian medial $f$ ，as well as initial $f,=\mathrm{I}$ ．E．$d h$ ，as in O．U．mefa for mefia，O．O．mefiar＝L．mediae，O．U．verfale $=$ L．verbale，\＆c．This interchange between $f$ and $d h$ is easily explained ；consult §． 55 ．We frequently hear children saying fum for thumb，\＆c．；also fyrst is a dialectic form of thirst．
$F=$ I．E．gh：formus，（hot）fornax，Skr．gharma（warm）， Gr．$\theta$ ：$\rho \mu o ́ s$, E．warm ；frio，frico，O．U．frehtu＝L．frictum， Skr．ghar（to sprinkle），gharsh（to rub），Gr．xpíu；fons，futis （vas aquarium），fundo， Gr ．$\chi^{\frac{\varepsilon}{\varepsilon} \omega}$ for $\chi^{\mathrm{E}} \mathbf{F} \omega$ ，from R．$\chi^{v}$ ，Goth． giuta（I pour）；O．L．fostis＊$=$ hostis $=$ Goth．gasts（a guest）， Skr．ghas（to eat）；O．L．folus＝holus，olus，helvus，flavus （flava is applied to Ceres，as $\chi$ 入on is to Demeter），Skr．hari （green），Gr．$\chi$ 入ó，E．green：O．L．fariolus＝hariolus，harus－ pex，Skr．（Ved．）hirâ（entrails），L．hira，hilla（entrails），O．N． garnir（intestines）；O．L．foedus＝hæedus，E．goat；fra－gra－re is said to be a re－duplicated form of an I．E．ghr $\hat{a}=$ Skr．$g h r \hat{a}$ （to smell），\＆c．In the same way $g h$ is pronounced as $f$ in E ． laugh，cough，tough，\＆c．
$F$ never represents an I．E．$p$ ，except when $s$ originally preceded，as in fallo $=$ Gr．$\sigma \phi$ á $\lambda \lambda \omega$ ，fungus $=\mathrm{Gr} . \sigma \phi$ ó $\gamma{ }^{\circ}$ os， funda beside $\sigma \phi \varepsilon \nu \delta o ́ v \eta$ ，fides（catgut）beside Gr．$\sigma \phi i ́ \delta \eta$（cat－ gut）．We hear children frequently saying funge for spunge， foon for spoon，\＆c．Aufrecht connects N．U．frite（ritu）with Skr．prî（to love），and ascribes $f$ to the aspirating influence of the following $r$ ，as in Gr．$\tau$ é $\phi \rho a$（ashes）beside Skr．tap（to burn），A．S．thefian（aestuare），G．dampf（steam）．Fluo has nothing to do with Gr．$\pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega$ from R．$\pi \lambda \nu$ ，but is probably con－ nécted with Gr．$\phi \lambda \dot{v} \omega$ ；pluit is the true Latin representative

[^52]of R. $\pi \bar{\lambda} v$. In Oscan $t$ aspirates a preceding $p$, as in N. O. scriftas $=$ L. scriptae (nom. pl. fem.) ; in Umbrian this $f$ became $h$, as in $O . \mathrm{U}$. scrē̄hto $=\mathrm{L}$. scriptum.

Medial $f$ between vowels occurs in scrofa, rufus, compounds of R. fer, as signifer, sifilus beside sibilus, Afer, vafer, and tofus, and the derivatives of these words.
$V=\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . v:$ aevum, Skr. êva (course), Gr. aiês, Goth. aivs (aíwv) ; ventus, Skr. vâ (to breathe), Gr. ä $\omega$, ả $\eta \rho, a v \not \rho a$, from R. aF, Goth. vinds (wind); ver, Skr. vasanta (ver), Gr. ${ }^{\prime} a \rho$, Lith. vasarà (summer) ; virus $=$ Skr. vishas (poison), Gr. lós; vitex, vimen, vitta, vitis, vinum, Skr. vîtikâ (a band), vêtra (a reed), Gr. i'ruc, E. withe; ovis = Skr. avis (a sheep), Gr. őïs, Lith. avìs (a sheep), E. ewe; novus = Skr. navas (new), Gr. v£os, Ch. Sl. novŭ (new); venum, veneo, vendo, Skr. vasnas (nom. sing. masc. prime cost), vasnam (nom. sing. neut. hire), Gr. ${ }^{\AA} v o s$, Ch. Sl. věniti (to sell); verna, vestibulum* (according to Bopp), Skr. vas (to dwell), Gr. äбтv; Vesta, Skr. ush (to burn) = I. E. vas, Gr. évтía; Bopp, however, connects Vesta and éarıa with Skr. vas (to dwell), \&c.
$V$ is vocalised frequently in Latin : quatuor, Skr. k'atvâras, Goth. fidvör; vacuos for vacvos, contiguos for contigvos, ingenuos for ingenvos, \&c., where term. $-u o=-v o$, as found in alvos, arvom, \&c.; sūdo (according to Schleicher) for suido, as senatus for senatuis, Skr. svid (to sweat), Gr. iסíw.
$V$ is retained in Old Latin, Old Umbrian, and Old Oscan, after $o, u$, and $\dot{u}$, where, in later times, it disappeared, as O. L. sovos $=$ suus, flovont $=$ fluunt ; O. U. tuves $=$ N. U. duir $=\mathrm{L} \cdot d u o b u s$, O. O. suveis, suivad $=\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{L} . \operatorname{sovi}$, sovad $=\mathrm{L}$. sui, sua, \&c. In Old Oscan we find $v$ retained before consonants, as in tuivtiks = L. tūticus beside N. O. toutad, from St. tuvta$=0 . \mathrm{U}$. tuta- (a city).

- Mommsen explains vestibulum as meaning dressing-room, from vestis, so called from the fact that the Romans only wore the tunic in the house, and put on the toga when they were going out.
$M=\mathrm{I}$. E. $m$ : morior, Skr. mar (to die), Gr. ${ }^{\prime \prime}-\mu \beta \rho o \cdot \tau o s$, from R. $\mu \circ \rho, \mu a \rho a i ́ \nu \omega$, Goth. maurthr (murder) ; memor, Skr.
 mensis = I. E. mansas = Skr. mâsas (a month), Z. mâonila (a month), Gr. $\mu \eta \dot{\eta} \nu$, Ion. $\mu \varepsilon ́ \iota \varsigma, \mu \eta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta$, Eol. $\mu \eta \tilde{\eta \nu \nu o s ~ f o r ~} \mu \eta \nu \sigma o s$; $m e$, Skr. mâm, and ma (me), Gr. $\mu \mathfrak{c}$, Goth. mik (me); $-m$ (sign of acc. sing.) $=$ Skr. $-m$, as equum $=$ Skr. as vam; $-m$ (in sum $)=$ Skr. $-m i=$ Gr. $-\mu$, as $s u m=$ Skr. asmi $=$ Gr. $\varepsilon i \mu i$; mergo, perhaps for mesgo connected by Bopp with Skr. mag'g' (mergi), Lith. mazgøju (lavo), \&c.
$M$ represents a Skr. $v$, according to Bopp, in clamo $=$ Skr. s'râvayâmi, a causal of $s^{\prime} r u$ (to hear), and mâre $=$ Skr. vâri (water). In both these cases Bopp appears to be wrong, for clā-mo is much more easily.connected with Gr. $\kappa \alpha \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varepsilon, \kappa \lambda \tilde{\eta} \sigma \iota \varsigma$, L. calare, nomen-clä-tor, than with Skr. s'ru, and mare probably meant originally $a$ desert, connected with Skr. maru, (a desert), mar (to die), Ir. muir, E. moor, mere, Gr. 'A $\mu \phi$ í$\mu a \rho-o s$ ( $a$ son of Poseidon). Other examples of this interchange of $v$ and $m$ have been brought forward, but all of them are even more doubtful than clamo and mare. Thus Bopp considers Gr. $\delta \rho \notin ́ \mu \omega=$ Skr. dravâmi from $d r u$ (to run), though it is much simpler to connect it directly with Skr. dram (to go).
$M$ represents a Skr. bl, according to Bopp, in maxilla beside Skr. blakish (to eat), aṇ multus beside Skr. blû̂ri (multus). These comparisons are just as doubtful as those between $v$ and $m$. Curtius is inclined to assent to the opinion that maxilla is connected with Gr. $\mu a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \mu a \gamma \varepsilon \varepsilon_{s}$ (a baker), and, consequently, means the organ "quod cibos depsit ac subigit." Bopp had his own misgivings about the connexion of multus with bhûri, for he also suggests that it may be related to Skr. puru (multus). Multus, though apparently connected with Gr. $\mu \nu \rho i o s$, has never yet been satisfactorily explained.* $M$ is = $b h$ in the Umbrian sing. loc. term.

[^53]-mem; if this be $=$ Skr. -bhyam (in tubhyam) or -bhyâm. Similarly in Lith. dual dat. wilkam, $-m=$ Skr. -bhyâm.

## §. 81. Assimilation.

I. When two consonants come together, the first is often made the same as the second. After long vowels only one of these double consonants could be heard in pronunciation, and consequently only one was written; it is therefore impossible to distinguish such cases from those where a consonant has disappeared with or without compensation. Schleicher reduces all the latter cases to those of assimilation, and considers that a consonant, before it vanished, was first assimilated to the following one. After short vowels the double consonants are generally written. $\mathrm{Cc}_{\mathrm{c}}$ $(c q)=d c$ in accurro, quicquid, quicquam, iccirco. $\quad C c=b c$ in succurro, occurro. Cc perhaps $=g c$ in saccus and soccus* beside Skr. sag (to cover), and Gr. $\sigma$ áy ; saccus is however most likely borrowed. $\quad C c=s c$ in siccus $=$ Skr. s'ushkas (dry). Gg
 $\bar{a} j o=a g j o$ beside $a d-\bar{g}-i u m$; $m \bar{j} j o$ for $m \bar{y} j o=m \check{a} j o$ beside mingo, Gr. R. $\mu \chi \chi=$ Skr. mih; pulējum for pulëgjum. We find $j=d j, r j, ~ s j$, nsj in sējungo, pējero, dījudico, träjicio respectively, \&c. Pejor is connected by Benfey with Skr. pâpa (bad), and if this view be correct, it must stand for pepjor ; Bopp, however, connects it with Skr. piy (conviciari), Goth. fjan (to hate), E. fiend. Tt $=d t$ in attraho. $T t=k t$ in littera for lictera, beside Skr. likh (to write) ; Schweitzer con-
veloped. There existed, most probably, in Indo-European a root mar (to pound) from which were derived L. mola, E. mill, meal, Gr. $\mu$ v́dos, $\mu v ́ \lambda \eta, \& c$.; for a full discussion of this root, consult Max Müller, Lectures II., p. 315, seq.

* Spiegel connects soccus with Z. hakha (the sole of the foot) connected with Skr. sak' (to follow, to cling to), whence Skr. sakhi (a friend) sakiva (a friend) beside L. sequor, socius.
neets thisword with Skr. lip (oblinere), and therefore considers it to have arisen from liptera; but pt remains unchanged in Latin, as in aptus, ruptus, \&c. In Vitorius (on an inscription belonging to times of First Punic War, and also on very late inscriptions), and the late forms autor, Adauta for auctor, Adaucta, $c$ was probably first assimilated to $t$, and then fell out, just as in late Latin we find such forms as otto, praefetto, and in Italian benedetto, maledetto. Autumnus is also for Auctumnus, from aug-eo ; Corssen appears to be mistaken in connecting it with Gr. á $\omega$ for ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{F} F \omega$, which is found only in infin. pres. ä $\mu \varepsilon \nu a \iota$ (to satiate). $T=T t=n t$ in $\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{O}$. set $=\mathrm{L}$. sunt. Similarly in Old Irish we find $-t=-n t$ in the term. s of the 3 pl. of the verb, as $-a t,-e t=\mathrm{L} .-u n t,-e t a r=\mathrm{L} .-u n t u r$; we also find etar $=\mathrm{L}$. inter, cét $=\mathrm{L}$. centum. $\quad D d$ (and then $d)=s d$ in $j \bar{u} d e x$ for $j u s d e x, \bar{\imath} d e m$ for $\check{\tau} d e m$, dīduco for'disduco. Ss (and then $s)=c s(x)$, as in Sestius $=$ Sextius ; praetestati $=$ praetextati ; frassinus $=$ fraxinus ; trissāgo (the herb germander) $=$ trixago (Cels. 8. 3) ; cossim (on both the hips), from coxa, connected with Skr. kukshi (the belly), and Gr. кох $\omega \nu \eta$ for ко $\xi^{\xi} \omega \nu \eta$; 0. U. esuk for eksuk; O. O. meddeís beside $\mu \varepsilon \delta \delta \varepsilon ı \xi$. Similarly we have O. I. dess, des beside dexter, Ch. Sl. desinŭ (dexter) Skr. dakshina (dexter) ; O. I. ass-, ess- = L. ex. $\quad S_{s}=d s$ in assuesco, assimulo, cessi for cedsi, pēs for pěds, esse (to eat) for edse. $S s=t s$ in possum for potsum, concussi for concutsi, fons for fonts, \&c. $S s=n s$ in Oscan acc. pl. viass $=$ L. vias for vians, \&c.; similarly in $0-$ and $i$ - stems the Oscan acc. pl. ends in -uss and $-\stackrel{e}{e} s$. We find $s=s s=n s$ in formōsus for formonsus, the suffix of which is perhaps the same as Skr. -vant; also in cosul, cesor, quoties, \&c. beside consul, censor, quotiens, \&c. $S s=r$ in russum, sussum, retrossum, beside rursum, sursum, retrorsum, also written rūsum, \&c. ; prossum and prosa beside prorsum ; dossuarius (bearing a burden), from dorsum ; possideo from porsideo. $S s=b s$ in $j u s s i ;=m s$ in pressi ; = vs in locassim, amasso, \&c. $\quad N n=d n$ in annuere, annare, annectere. Benfey connects L. annona with Skr. anna
(food) for $a d n a$, from R. $a d$ (to eat), but it much more probably belongs to L. annus. $N n=m n$ in annus for amnus, whence comes solemnis, from $a m=a m b i$ (round), meaning a ' complete revolution of the sun'; Vitunnus beside Vitumnus, Neptünus beside Neptumnus, Portūnus beside Portumnus. $N n=m n$ in conniti. $N n=s n$ in penna for pesna, and this for petna from R.pet (to fly). $R r=d r$ in arridere; $=b r$ in surripere $;=n r$ in irrumpere; $=m r$ in corripere ; \&c. $R r=c r$ in serra from R. ses (to cut) and $=t r$ in parricida for patricida (?). $L l=d l$ in alligare $;=n l$ in illinere ; $=m l$ in collocare ; $r l$ in intelligere, pellucere; \&c. $L l=d l$ also in sella for sedla; lapillus for lapidlus ; Aufellius beside Aufidus, \&c. $\quad L l=r l$ in gallus $=$ garlus, Skr. gar (to call), Gr. $\gamma \tilde{\eta} \rho v_{\varsigma}, ~ Г \eta \varrho v \omega \nu$, E. call; olla = orula from a R. var (to seethe), which is found in Gr. $\beta \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega$ and $\beta \rho a ́ \zeta \omega$ (I boil) from R. $\beta \rho a=$ F $\rho a$, Lith. virti (to boil), Ch. Sl. vrěti (fervere), U. H. G. wäli (heat) ; puella = puerla for puerula ; ampulla beside ampora; stella beside à $\sigma \tau \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho$; Tibullus from Tibur, \&c. $L l=n l$ in asellus beside asinus; corolla beside corona; homullus beside St. homon-; Messalla from Messana; illico (in Plautus ilico) $=$ in loco. $\quad L l=c l$ in paullus for pauculus (?). $P p=d p$ in appello; $=b p$ in oppono. $\quad F f=b f$ in officium, suffoco; = df in afferre; cf in efferre; =sf in diffugere. When a preceding consonant is assimilated to $v$, it disappears sometimes with and sometimes without compensation. Thus we have no compensation in lĕvis for legvis, Gr. è̉ađúvs; brëvis for bregvis, Gr. $\beta \rho a \chi$ v́c ; nivis for nigvis, beside nix for nigs, nin. guo: in vivere and connīvere, on the other hand, we find compensation for the $v$ thrown out. $\quad M m=p m$ in summus; = gm in flagma ; = bm in summittere ; = $n m$ in immittere, \&c.
II. When two consonants come together, the second is often made the same as the first. Tt perhaps $=t y$ in mitto for mityo. Ss $=s t$ in superl. term. -issimus, as in longissimus, $-i s-$ being the remains of the old compar. term yans; os, St. ossi $=o s t i$, Skr. asthi (a bone), Gr. ó $\sigma \tau \notin o v ;$ censor $=$ cens-tor $=\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{O}$. censtur, censum $=\mathrm{N}$. O. censtum. When $t$ is preceded by $t$ or
$d$, the first dental generally becomes $s$, and then the second is assimilated to it, so that $d t$ and $t t$ become $s s$, or $s$ after long vowels and consonants: thus we have fessus for fettus, beside fatigo, adfatim; ēsum for edtum, from edo (I eat), beside est (he eats) $=$ edit ; foss $a=$ fodta, fodio ; missus $=$ mittus, mitto; $\bar{u} s u s$ and ussus (on inscriptions) $=u t t u s, u t i ; ~ c l a u s u s=c l a u d t u s$ claudo ; fissus $=$ fidtus, findo; versus $=$ vert-tus, verto, \&c. So in Irish we find $s s$ for $s t$ in borrowed words, as fess $=\mathrm{L}$. festum ; also in words not borrowed the same law holds as in Latin; thus we find fiss (scientia) for fidtis, from R. fid = I. E. vid (to know), \&c. In Oscan $t t$ is kept, and does not become ss as in Latin: we find O. O. uittiuf beside L. ūsus from uti. $N n=$ $n d$ : dispennite hominem divorsum et distennite (Miles Gloriosus, 1407), for dispendite, distendite ; grunnio for grundio, E. grunt; O. O. upsannam $=\mathrm{L}$. operandam $; \mathrm{N} . \mathrm{U}$. pihanēr $=\mathrm{L}$. piandi (gen. sing.) ; N. U. panupei = L. quandoque; but when $n d$ in Umbrian represents an older $n t$, it does not become $n n . \quad R r$ $=r y$ in curro, Skr. k'ar (to go), O. H. G. horsc (quick), E. horse. $R r=r s$ : torreo for torseo beside tostus for torstus, Skr. tarsh (to thirst), Gr. $\tau$ f́poouaı; terra (dry land) for tersa from same root as last ; ferrem for fersem; porro for porso, Gr. $\pi \rho$ ó $\sigma \omega$; far for fars- and this perhaps for fart-, compare Skr. bhrti (nourishment) from bhar (to bear), N. U. farsio = L. farreum; terreo $=$ terseo, Skr. tras (to tremble), Gr. т $\rho \notin \omega$ from R. т $\rho \varepsilon \varsigma$,
 Goth. airzjan (to wander) ; verres (a boar) = verses beside Skr. varsh (to sprinkle), vrsha (a bull); garrio* $=$ garsio beside Lith. gàrsas (the voice); horreo = horseo, Skr. hrsh (horrere). $\quad R r$ $=r t$ in pulcerrimus, celerrimus; here rt probably passed through the stage $r s . \quad L l$ perhaps $=l k$ in follis (a bag) be-

[^54]side Gr. $\theta$ údakos (a bag), $\theta v \lambda \lambda i ́ s ~(a ~ b a g), ~ G o t h . ~ b a l g s . ~ L l=~$ ly in pello, fallo, percello, tollo ; cella for celia beside L. celo, domicilium, Skr. khala (a threshing-floor), s'âlâ (a house) Gr. ка入ıá (a hut), unless cella be for celula; procella for procelia, beside Skr. kal (to impell), Gr. кє́ $\lambda_{\eta S}$, $\beta$ ovкó ${ }^{\prime}$ os (a cow-herd), L. cello, celox, celer ; O. allo (nom. sing. fem.) = L. alia, Gr. $a ̈ \lambda \lambda o s, O . H . G . a l l e s ~(o t h e r w i s e) . ~ L l=l t ~ i n ~ s u p e r ~ t e r m . ~-i l-~$ limus $=-$ iltimus, as facillimus, \&c.; fel, fell-is (gen. sing.) $=$
 $\mu \varepsilon \lambda i \sigma \sigma a=\mu \varepsilon \lambda \iota \tau y a$, Goth. milith (honey). Bopp wrongly considers mellis to be for melvis, connecting it with Skr. madhu (honey). Lt in becoming $l l$ probably passed through the stage $l s$, as pulsus is for pultus. $\quad L l=l d$ in Pollux $=$ Gr. По$\lambda \nu \delta \varepsilon u ́ k \eta s$, and, according to Bopp, in malleus for maldeus, beside Skr . mard (to pound). $L l=l s$ in vellem $=$ velsem, velle $=$ velse ; collum = colsum, G. hals (the neck). $L l=\ln$ in vellus villus beside Skr. ûrna (wool), Lith. vilna (wool), Ch. Sl. vlüna (wool), Goth. vulla (wool) ; collis (according to Curtius) $=$ colnis beside Gr. кo八 $\omega$ vós, Lith. kálnas (height), A. S. holm (a hill). $L l=l v$ in pallor, pallidus beside O. H. G. falo, falwer, G. falb, Lith. pàlvas, (pale), Ch. Sl. plavŭ (white);* pellis $=$ pelvis, beside pulvinar, G. fell (a hide), Gr. $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \lambda a$ (a hide), vallis perhaps for valvis, Gr. है̀ $\lambda o s,{ }^{\prime} \mathrm{E} \lambda$ éa, ${ }^{7} \mathrm{H} \lambda \iota \iota$; sollus (solliferreus, solli-citus, soll-ers) $=$ Skr. sarvas, (omnis), Gr. ö ${ }^{2}$ os, Ion. oũ $\mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{c}}=\mathrm{o} \lambda \mathrm{Fos} ;$ mollis $=$ molvis, beside Gr. $\mu \bar{\omega} \lambda \mathrm{v}_{\varsigma}$ (sluggish). $P p=p t$ in quippe, ipsippe (ipsi neque alii, Fest. p. 105), beside mepte, mihipte (Cato pro ' mihi ipsi,' Fest. p. 152, 154.), vopte (vos ipsi, Fest. p. 379): -pte $=-$ pote, (compare ut-pote), -potis.
III. When two consonants come together, the first is generally made like the second, or affected by it in some way,

[^55]the second consonant still remaining unchanged. Thus, sonant consonants become surd before surd consonants : actus $=$ agtus, R. ag; scriptus = scribtus, R. scrib, connected perhaps with Gr. $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega ;$ ructo = rugto, beside L. enugo, Gr. é $\rho \varepsilon v^{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\omega}$; fictor, fictilis beside L. fingo, figura, Skr. dih (to smear), Gr. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell}-\theta \iota \gamma$-ov; luctus beside L. lugeo, Skr. rug' (vexare), Gr. $\lambda v \gamma \rho o ́ s ;$ mulctus beside L. mulgeo, Skr. marg' (mulcere), Gr. à $\mu$ ह́ $\lambda \boldsymbol{\gamma} \omega$; vectus beside veho, Skr. vah (vehere), Gr. oै $\chi$ os; lectus, lectica beside Gr. $\lambda$ é $\chi o s$, Goth. liga (I lie down); \&c. There are some apparent exceptions to this rule: thus, we find absens, subter, obtego, obtineo,* \&c., where $b$ is still retained; but these words were pronounced as apsens, \&c., for Quintilian (I. 7, 7) writes "cum dico obtinuit secundam $b$ litteram ratio poscit, aures magis audiunt $p$," and consequently we find them frequently written according to the pronunciation, as apsens, optineo, \&c., on inscriptions and in manuscripts. Before $r$ and $l$ surds frequently become sonants, as publicus $=0 . \mathrm{L}$. poplicos; negligo from nec and lego; quadrupes and quadraginta beside quatriduo, from quatuor; O. U. abruf $=\mathrm{L}$. apros. We also find surds becoming sonants before other sonants, as in segmentum from seco ; salignus from St. salic ; dignus from R. dic ; ilignus from St. ilec ; cygnus = Gr. кúкvos. M before gutturals becomes guttural $n$, and before dentals, dental $n$, as in anceps $=$ ambiceps $;$ concors $=$ comcors $;$ nunquam $=$ numquam ; contero $=$ comtero ; tandem $=$ tamdem ; \&c. Initial gutturals and dentals influence a preceding $m$, as in con quo $=$ com quo (on late inscriptions); an terminum $=a m t .=a m b i$ $t$; \&cc. $N$ before labials becomes $m$, as in impleo, \&c. Labial mutes before $n$ become $m$, as somnus = sopnus, beside L. sopio, Skr. svapnas = Gr. v̈ ṽvos; Samnium = Sabnium, beside Sabini; scamnum beside scabellum. In Old Latin $t$ before $n$ became $s$,

* The junction of two mutes is sometimes avoided by inserting $s$, as in abstineo, abscondo, ostendo for obstendo, asporto for adsporto.
as in pesna $($ penna $)=$ petna, resmus (rēmus) beside Gr. $\mu$ ós. In these cases $t$ became th through the aspirating influence of the nasal, and then th became $s$. This aspirating influence of a nasal upon a preceding surd mute is very common in Greek. O. L. cesna (cena) is perhaps = cedna beside Skr. khad (to eat), khâdana (food). Tr appears also in some cases to have become $b r$, through the steps $t r, t h r$, $d h r, b r$, the dental being aspirated by the following $r$ : consobrinus, from con and sostor = I. E. svästâr (sister), passed through the stages consostorinus, consostrinus, consosthrinus, consosdhrinus, and then $d h$ became $b$, as in ruber, \&c. : salubris passed through stages saluttris (from St. salut), salustris, salusthris, salusdhris, salūdhris, compare palustris from St. palud; muliebris $=$ muliestris, through a similar series of steps; tenebrae* $=$ tenesthrae $=$ tenestrae, perhaps from an I. E. tamastra, whence Skr. tamisra, beside Skr. tamas (darkness), Z. temainh (darkness), Lith. tamsà (darkness), O. H. G. demar (crepusculum), O. S. thim (dim), Ir. teim and temel (dark), W. tywyll (dark).
$T$ exercised an aspirating influence upon the preceding tenuis in Umbrian and Oscan: thus in Umbrian ct and pt became $h t$, as $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. scrēhto $=\mathrm{L} . \operatorname{scrīptum,~} \mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. rehte $=\mathrm{L}$. recte, O. U. subahtu for subactu $=$ L. subigito : in Oscan pt became $f t$ and $c t$, ht, as N. O. scriftas $=\mathrm{L}$. scriptae, N. O. Ohtavis $=$ L. Octavius, O. O. ehtrad $=$ L. extra, O. O. saahtim $=$ L. sanctum. This aspirating force of $t$ upon a preceding tenuis manifested itself also in late Latin, as in jachtivus. Such Italian forms, as oggetto, otto, perfetto, ottare, ottuso, \&c., from L. objectus, octo, perfectus, optare, obtusus, \&c., most probably passed through the intermediate forms objechtus, ochto, per-
* Consult Ebel, K. Z. XVI. 77, seq. ; Ascoli, K. Z. XVI. 196, seq.; Bopp, Skr. Gl. under tamas, who considers that tenebre is for tembra, $b$ being inserted for euphony (as in $\dot{\alpha} \mu \beta \rho o \sigma i a$ ) in temra beside Skr. timira (obscuritas) and tamisra.
fechtus, oftare, oftusus, \&c. In Irish* $c$ and $p$ before $t$ become ch, as ocht $=\mathrm{L}$. octo, recht (lex) for rect, lacht (milk) for lact, secht $=$ L. septem, necht $=$ L. neptis, \&c. In Welsh this $c h$ has disappeared, and we find W. wyth (eight) $=\mathrm{Ir}$. ochto, W. noith $=\mathrm{Ir}$. nocht (night), W. reith $=\mathrm{Ir}$. recht (lex), W. taith = Ir. techt (iter), \&c., the palatal vowel (i) making its appearance on account of the palatalization of the original guttural. A change similar to this last is found in E. night, might, eight beside G. nacht, macht, acht; and in the Romance languages as Port. oito, Prov. oit, Fr. huit from L. octo ; Port. noite, Prov. noit, Fr. nuit from L. noctem; Port. feito, Fr. fait from L. factom.

In Gothic we find a mute before a dental changed into the corresponding spirant, after which the dental always is or becomes $t$ : sauhts (sickness) for sukthis beside siuks (sick); mahts (might) for magthis from R. mag; ga-skafts (creation) beside ga-skap-jan; fra-gifts (lending) beside giban (to give. $H$ in these Gothie forms, sauhts, nahts (night) = Lith. naktis, raihts $=$ L. rectus, \&c., was very guttural ; and the corresponding $g h$ in English once had a strong guttural sound, as it still has in lowland Scotch, as in eneugh (enough), sheugh (a ditch), which are pronounced as enŭch, shŭch would be in English, or in the notation of the general alphabet as $\breve{\imath} \check{u} \chi^{2}, s^{3} \breve{u} \chi^{2}$. The guttural spirant prefers as neighbouring vowels, $o$ and $u$, and hence in Portuguese we find auto from L. actom, Outubro (October), doutor (doctor), \&c.: compare the English pronunciation of enough, laugh, thought. We can account for the remarkable substitution of $p t$ in Wallachian for L. ct from this

[^56]aspirating force of $t$. Ct passed through the stages cht, ght, $f t$ in becoming $p t$, and in a few cases remained at the $f t$ stage. Thus we have doftor $=\mathrm{L}$. doctor, leftice $=\mathrm{L}$. lectica, where $c t$ becomes $f t$ and copt $=\mathrm{L}$. coctus, fript $=\mathrm{L}$. frictus, pept $=\mathrm{L}$. pectus, \&c., where ct advances to $p t$.

In Modern Greek we also see the aspirating force of $t$ in ò $\chi^{\tau} \omega$ (eight), $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \phi \tau \eta \zeta$ from $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \pi \tau \eta \zeta, \chi^{\tau \varepsilon} \nu \nu$ from $\kappa \tau \varepsilon ́ v \iota o \nu$.
IV. When two consonants come together, the second is sometimes made like the first, or affected by it in some way. Thus $t$ often become $s$ after $r, l, c$ and the nasals: noxa for nocta from noceo ; fixus for figtus from figo; maximus for magtimus ; beside actus from ago; fictus from fingo; \&c.; sparsus for spargtus from spargo beside tortus for torctus and sartus; pulsus for pultus from pello; perculsus for percultus from percello; excelsus for exceltus from excello; \&c., beside sepultus from sepelio; mansum for mantum from maneo; tensus and tentus from tendo; \&c. When the group nt belongs to the same element of a word it is unchanged as in ferunt, amantem, \&c. T after $p$ is unchanged except in lapsus for laptus from R. lab. In Sanskrit we also frequently find $k s h(=k s)$ representing an older $k t$, as takshâ (a carpenter $=\mathrm{Gr}$. $\boldsymbol{\tau} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \kappa \tau \omega \nu$, nakshatra (a star) from nakta (night); consult §. 38.
V. Mutual influence of two consonants upon and approximation to each other, both consonants being changed. Thus suggillatio comes from sub and cilium : it is a translation of $\dot{v} \pi \omega \dot{\epsilon} \pi \iota \circ$ (a blow under the eyes), whence was derived $\dot{v} \pi \omega$ $\pi \iota a ́ \zeta \varepsilon \iota v$ (to beat black and blue, to mortify), Appulus for $A k$ vulus (as immos from iאFos) from aqua connected with Skr. apas (nom. pl. water), Goth. alva, A. S. ewe. This root is found in Ms $\varepsilon \sigma-\frac{1}{\bar{a}} \pi-t o \iota$ (the people between to two seas, compare such formations as Mєбототацia, M\&Өídoıov, Interamna), $\gamma \tilde{n}{ }^{\prime} \bar{A} \pi i ́ a$ (the Peloponnesus, now called Morea from Sl. more $=$ L. mare), $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi \dot{\xi} \dot{a} \pi i \eta s$ rainc (from the land across the sea), and perhaps the Volscian town Apiola.

## §. 82. Dissimilation.

A dental before a following $t$ becomes $s$ : thus we have equester for equet-ter from St. equet; pedester for pedetter from St. pedet; claustrum from R. claud; est (he eats) beside edit (in Plautus and Lucilius), \&c. We find a similar change in Zeud, Greek, Irish, Slavic, Lithuanian and Gothic, but not in Sanskrit. Thus in Skr. we have atti (he eats) from R. ad, \&c., while in Zeud* we find bas'ta (part. praet. pass.) from band (to bind), \&c. : for Greek examples consult §. 59 : in Irish we have rofestar (he knows) for rofedtar from R. vid, estar (he eats) from R. ed : in Slavic we have daste ( 2 pl . pres.) for dadte = I. E. dadatasi from R. da (to give), dasti (he gives) for $d a d t i=$ I. E. dadati, \&c. : in Lithuanian we have sés-czas (sitting) for sed-tjas beside sedè'ti (to sit), mèsti (to throw) beside metì (I throw), \&c.: in Gothic we have vaist (thou knewest) for vaitt beside vait (he knew), \&c.

The termination-alis is used for -aris when the stem to which it is added does not contain $l$ in the syllable preceding this termination; thus we have mortalis beside popularis, \&c. Similarly we find caeruleus for caeluleus from coelum and $P a$ rilia from Pales. When two consonants, the same or similar, follow each other, only separated by a vowel, this vowel is thrown out, and only one of the consonants retained : thus we have veneficus for venenificus ; semestris for semimestris ; semodius for semimodius; stipendium for stipipendium; nutrix for nutritrix from nutrire ; consuetudo for consuetitudo; aestas for aestitas from aestus; antestari for antetestari, \&c. $\dagger$ Simi-

 $\kappa \varepsilon \lambda a \iota \nu 0 \nu \varepsilon \phi \eta s$; \&c.

[^57]The following words may also be cases of dissimilation : dulcis for gulcis beside Gr. $\gamma \lambda \boldsymbol{\lambda}$ ки́s, the gutt. $g$ becoming $d$ on account of the next syllable beginning with gutt. $c$; in tenebrae beside Skr. tamisra and mihi beside tibi $=$ Skr. tubhyam, $m$ may have been changed into $n$ in the first case and $b h$ into $h$ in the second, to prevent two labials immediately following each other; in a few words $v$, when followed or preceded by $o$ or $u$, became $b^{*}$ as in ferbui for fervui and $b u$ bile for bovile; proximus for propsimus beside prope; tamen is for tamem, and it bears the same relation to tam that item does to ita.

## §. 83. Change of $S$ into $R$.

$S$, when it comes between two vowels, or between a vowel and a sonant consonant, or when final after a vowel, generally becomes $r$. Thus we have gero for geso beside ges-si; uro beside us-si; eram from R. es (to be); queri beside questus, R. ques $=$ Skr. s'vas (to sigh) ; auris for ausis beside aus-culto, Gr. oũs Hom. ov̌ara (pl.) ; haurio beside haus-tus; dirimo and diribeo for disimo and dishibeo; heri beside hes-ternus; sero, for seso, a reduplication of R. sa (to sow); nurus, Skr. snushâ (a daughter-in-law); virus, Skr. visha (poison); soror, Skr. svasâr; haeréo beside haesito ; aurora, Skr. ushas (the dawn); maero beside maestus; generis $=\mathrm{Gr} . \gamma^{\varepsilon} \nu \varepsilon о \varsigma=\mathrm{Græco} \mathrm{It}$. genesos ; oris, maris, muris, Liguris, \&c., from os, mas, mus, Ligus, \&c., beside masculus, musculus (a little mouse), Ligusticus, \&c.; -rum (term. of gen. pl.) for -sum as (is-) tarum $=$ Skr. tâsân; veternus for vetesnus from vetus; diurnus, hodiernus beside Diespiter; jurgo beside jus, justus; carmen beside Casmenae, connected with Skr. s'ans to praise); \&c. Final $s$ becomes $r$

[^58]in those cases where a vowel originally followed it, and perhaps in some other cases from the influence of analogy : amor (I am loved) is for amose, \&c.; amatur (he is loved) is for amatise, \&c. ;* majör is for majōs, $r$ probably arising from the influence of the oblique cases, beside majus, \&c.; similarly we have honor for honos, \&c. $S$ is often retained, as in vesica, casa, vasa (pl. of ras), pusillus, cāsus = cassus for cadtus, and whenever $s$ represents $s s$, quaeso beside quaero, nasus beside nares, miser beside maereo, posui, nisi, and compounds with de as desino, \&c. In Old Latin we find such forms as Lases for Lares, fasena $=$ harena, Fusius, esit $=$ erit, \&c. L. Papirius Crassus (Consul b. c. 366) changed his name from Papisius to Papirius; from this we see that the substitution of $r$ for $s$ had already shown itself early in the fourth century B. C. In Umbrian and Oscan $s$ is often retained between two vowels: O. U. asa $=0$. L. asa (ara), O. O. aasas, aasai = O. L. asas, asai (aras, arae). We find, however, O. U. eru, N. U. erom as the infin. of R. es (to be). In Oscan the term. of gen. pl. becomes $-a z u m$ and in Umbrian -aru $=$ L. -arum I. E. -âsâm.

## § 84. The Rejection of a Consonant.

The rejection of one of two medial consonants belongs perhaps properly to the province of assimilation, as has been already pointed out in $\S 81$. The vanishing of a consonant between two vowels is also treated by Schleicher as a kind of assimilation ; when a surd in this position vanishes, it must

* This is the ordinary account given of the origin of the Latin passive, but there are several objections to it which render it somewhat doubtful. In the first place, the form of the second pers. pl. (amamini, \&c.) is evidently a participle in -menus $=\mathrm{Gr} .-\mu \varepsilon \nu \circ \varsigma=\mathrm{Skr} .-$ mânas, and if in the 1 st and 3rd pers. pl. final $r$ represents the reflexive pronouns, how can we account for the 2nd pers. being formed so differently from them? In the second place, the passive in Irish ended in $r$, which never represented an older $s ;$ e. g. Ir. bertar $=$ L. feruntur, Ir. berthar $=$ L. fertur, \&c.
have first become a sonant. The disappearance of initial consonants is quite a distinct phenomenon, and cannot be ascribed to the influence of assimilation.

Initial $c$ has very rarely vanished; it may have done so in the following examples:-ubi, unde, uter, ut beside ali-cubi, ali-cunde, from I. E. St. kva (who), whence Skr. kas (who) = L. quis = Goth. hvas, Skr. kataras $=$ Gr. $\pi$ ótẹoç (Ion. кórepos) = L. uter, E. whether; ut = quod: Weber however connects $u b i, u t i, \& c$., with a pronominal stem that is found in Skr. $u$ (utrum), uta (vel, aut), but the preceding view is far more probable. Curtius' connects Gr. vev́u, L. nuo, co-niveo (conixi), nïco, nictus, nictor with Goth. hneiva (I bend), O. H. G. hniga (I bend), and accordingly assumes that the original root was $k n u$ from which by gunation we form knav, whence we have Goth. hniv; the form co-niveo points back also to an initial guttural, for, if the root began with $n$, we would have found con-niveo: he supposes also that we find the lost $\kappa$ in $\kappa \nu \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \omega$ (I nod, slumber) $=\kappa \nu \omega \kappa y \omega$ from $\kappa \nu \omega \kappa$ (as $\pi \tau \dot{\omega} \sigma \sigma \omega$ from $\pi \tau \omega \kappa)=\kappa \nu о a \kappa=\kappa \nu 0 \mathrm{~F}-a \kappa . \quad$ Ludus, O . L. loidos, may be connected with Skr. krîd (to play). Libum may be for klibum beside Gr. крıßávn, Goth. hlaifs, E. loaf, \&c. Jurmann derives lustrum (for clustrum $=$ cludtrum) from kilud, a secondary form of R. klu whence O. L. cluere, ('cluere antiqui purgare dicebant.' Plin. xxv. 29, 36), cloaca, Gr. $k \lambda$ ú $\ell_{\omega}(I$ wash ), Goth. hlutrs (pure), O. H. G. hlūtar. Corssen derives luscinia from cluos or clovos ( $=$ Skr. s'ravas and Gr. $\kappa \lambda$ हos) and cano, explaining the name accordingly as "the sweet songstress;" others derive it from luscus,* and explain it as meaning "the twilight songstress." $K$ was similarly lost in Gr. $\lambda \hat{a} \xi$ for $\kappa \lambda a \xi$ beside L. calx, E. heel. Vapor and vappa are for cvapor and
 Hesych.), кaтvós, \&c., Lith. kvápas (breath) : Crain connects

[^59]opinor with this root, but Corssen prefers to connect it with Gr. öббоцаı for òкyоцає. Vermis is for kevermis = Skr. krmis (a worm) according to Corssen, but Curtius considers that Skr. krmis (nom. sing.) Lith. kirmis (a worm), Ch. Sl. criv̌ (a worm) are quite unconnected with vermis, Gr. $z^{2} \lambda \mu \nu \mathrm{~s}$, Goth. vaurms, which belong to I. E. root var (to roll), whence Gr. $\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \dot{v} \omega$, ${ }^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega \omega$, L. volvo, \&c.

Medial $c$ is lost before a vowel in sirpea, sirpicus beside scirpus, scirpeus, O. H. G. scilaf (sedge); sipo, dis-sipo beside Skr. kship (to throw) for skip, G. schupfen (to push); sarmentum, sarpio for scarmentum, scarpio beside O. H. G. scarf, G. scharf (sharp), from a root scar $+p$, scar being found in Gr. $\kappa \varepsilon i ́ \rho \omega, \xi \nu \rho o ́ v$, E. sheers, plough-share, \&c. Medial $c$ is lost before $t$ in Sestius beside Sextius, mistus beside mixtus; sescenti for sexcenti; mulsus for mulctus from mulceo; fartus for farctus ; sartus for sarctus ; Quintius = Quinctius; ultor for ulctor beside ulcisci ; tortus for torctus from torqueo; vito for vic(i)to beside Skr. vik' (to separate), Gr. $\begin{array}{ll} \\ \text { ikw } \\ \text { from R. Fıк ; in-vitus* }\end{array}$ for in-vic(i)tus beside Skr. vas' (to desire), Gr. $\mathfrak{e} \kappa \kappa \dot{\nu}$ from R. $\boldsymbol{F}_{\varepsilon \kappa} ;$ in-vito for in-vic (i)to beside Skr. val' (to speak), Gr. ë $\pi \mathrm{os}$, L. voco. $\quad C$ is lost before $d$ in quindecim for quincdecim ; sedecim for sexdecim. $C$ is lost before $s$ in torsi for torcsi; sarsi for sarcsi; disco for dicsco beside didici ; ursus for urcsus, Skr. ŗssha (a bear), Gr. äpктоs; parsimonia for parcsimonia ; musca for mucsca $\dagger$ beside Skr. makshikâ (a fly), Z. makshi, Gr. $\mu \nu u ̈ a$ for $\mu v \sigma \iota a$, O. H. G. mucca (culex), A. S. micge. $C$ is lost before $n$ in quernus for quercnus; vānus for văcnus beside vă-

[^60]cuus; dè̀nì for děcni; pīnus for p̌̌cnus beside pı̆c-is ; quini for quincni; lūna for lŭcna from R. luc = Skr. ruk' (to shine); sēni for sexni; ex becomes $e$ - in enarro, enato; pānis for păcnis, according to Bopp, beside Skr. pak' (to bake), but according to Curtius connected with Skr. pâ (sustentare), L. pa-bulum, pa-scor, pas-tor, Pă-les, pe-nus (omne quo vescimur, Cic.), pe-nates, penes, Lith. pénas (fodder), pénù (pasco), \&c. $C$ is lost before $l$ in $\bar{a} l a$ for $a c$-la beside axilla, Gr. áк $\chi o ́ s$ (the shoulder), O. H. G. ahsala (the shoulder); tela for texla beside texo; culina for cuclina beside coquo, coquina. $C$ is lost before $v$ in sevir for sexvir; coniveo for conicveo beside conixi, nico, nictus ; obliviscor perhaps for oblicviscor beside linquo, but Corssen prefers to connect it with the same root as livor, līvidus, comparing Horace's expression lividas obliviones. C is lost before $m$ in tormentum for torcmentum from torqueo; semestris for sexmestris; lūmen for lŭcmen from R. luc; pomum for pocmum (lit. "what is ripe ") beside Skr. pak' (coquere), but, according to Curtius, for pormum (lit. "what has grown") from an I. E. root pu (to grow), whence Skr. pu-mâins (a man), $p u$-tra (a son), Gr. $\pi$ oía for $\pi o F \iota a, \pi \tilde{\omega} \lambda o s$ for $\pi o F \lambda o s$, $\pi a i ̈ s$ and $\pi$ áïs for $\pi a \mathrm{~F}$-ıঠs, L. pa-pavier, pra-pu-tium ; ōmen for ocmen beside Gr. öббоцає for öкуоцаı, Goth. ahman (spirit), amnis for acmenis from I. E. R. ak or akv (to be quick) whence aqua, \&c., but Bopp connects it directly with Vedic apnas (aqua) ; temo for texmo, beside Skr. taksh (to form, to cut), Gr. тík-т $\omega, \tau^{\prime} \chi \chi \nu \eta, \tau \varepsilon v ́ \chi-\omega$, O. H. G. dehsa (an axe).

Initial $g$ was lost before $n$ in nosco, notus, nomen, narro beside co-gnosco, co-gnomen, O. L. gnarigo (narro), gnarus from I. E. gna (toknow), whence Skr. g'nâ, Gr. $\xi_{-}^{\prime}-\gamma \nu \omega \nu$, O. H. G. $k n \bar{a} u$ (I know), \&c. ; norma (= Gr. $\gamma \nu \omega ́ \mu \omega \nu$ in meaning), is for gnorima from last root, according to Benfey; natus beside cognatus, nitor, nixus beside gnitor, gnixus, O. H. G. hnegenti (nitens), ana-hnekenti (innitentes), Goth. ana-hnaiv-jan (to place upon something). $G$ was lost before $l$ in lucuns from Gr. $\gamma \lambda$ uкoũs; lact- beside Gr. $\gamma$ ádaкr-; and according to

Bopp, in lassus for glassus beside Skr. glâsnu (weary). $G$ is lost before $v$ in venio, vădum, vādo from I. E. gva (to go), when Skr. $g \hat{a}$ (to go), Gr. $\beta$ aív $\omega$, és $\beta \eta \nu$ from R. $\beta a$, Goth. quiman (to come); voro from I. E. gvar, whence Skr. gar (to devour), Gr. $\beta$ ọá; vivus, vita, victus beside Skr. g'îv (to live), Gr. ßios, Goth. quius (living), E. quick; volo beside Skr. gal (to fall), Gr. $\beta a^{\prime} \lambda \lambda \omega$ (as Skr. pat means both to $f l y$ and to fall); venter perhaps for gventer, from R. gen = I. E.gvan, but connected by Curtius and Benfey with Skr. g'athara (venter), Gr. $\gamma \boldsymbol{a \sigma \tau} \dot{\rho}$, Goth. quithus (the belly), laus-quithr-s (inanem ventrem habens) ; vescor, according to Bopp, for gvescombeside Skr. ghas (to eat), to which he also joins Gr. yaotín ; Bopp connects vasto with Skr. g'as (laedere), Goth. fra-quistja (deleo), considering the original form to have been guasto; he also connects vigilo for gvigilo with the Skr. g'âgar (vigilare), O. H. G. wachar (vigil). These comparisons of Bopp are, however, extremely doubtful : as to vigil, Curtius is probably correct in connecting it with L. vigeo, vegeo.

Medial $g$ is lost before a following $j$, after having been assimilated to it, and then the preceding vowel, if short, is lengthened in compensation : thus we have mējo for migjo, mäjor for măgjor, \&c. G is lost before $t$ in indultus for indulgtus, sparsus $=$ spartus for spargtus, mulsus for mulgtus, tersus for tergtus, \&c. $G$ is lost before $s$ in fulsi, ursi, versi, indulsi, tersi, \&c, from fulgeo, \&c.; compesco for compegsco, from R. pag (or pak) beside pignus, pango, pac-iscor, pax, Skr. pag'-ra (firm), Gr. $\pi \eta \gamma \nu v \mu \iota, \& c$. $G^{*}$ is lost before $l$ in sťtlus for stiglus beside Gr. $\sigma \tau i ́ \zeta \omega$, L. distinguo ; pälus for paglus from the root pag, and perhaps in filum (a string) for figlum beside figo. $G$ is lost before $v$ in vivüs for gvigvus; brěvis for bregvis, Gr. $\beta \rho a-$ $\chi$ र́s ; lĕvis for legvis, Gr. è̀ $\lambda \chi$ र́s; nivis for nigvis beside ninguo, nix; malo for mavolo from magevolo; malva beside Gr. $\mu a-$ $\lambda a ́ \chi \eta$; uveo, uvidus for ugveo, ugvidus from I. E. ug whence Skr. uksh (conspergere, humectare) $=u g+s$, Gr. $\dot{v} \gamma-\rho o ́ s, ~ \& c . ;$
fruor for frugvor beside frugi* (useful), fruges, Skr. bhug' (edere, frui), Goth. brukjan, O. H. G. prūchan, brūchan, G. brauchen (to use), E. brook; torvus for torgvus beside Skr.
 $\tau \rho a \chi$ v́s, A. S. threagan (to chide), O. H. G. drawa for drahwa, G. drohen (to menace) ; fulvus for fulgvus beside fulgeo, flagro, \&c.; lues for lugves, if it be connected with Skr. rug' (vexare), Gr. $\lambda v \gamma \rho$ ós, $\lambda$ oryós, L. lugeo, luctus, \&c.; faveo and foveo are for fagveo and fogveo, according to Corssen, who connects them with Skr. bhag' (colere, amare, coquere?), which he supposes to have originally meant "to heat." Curtius connects faveo with Skr. bhâ (to shine), bhâsh (to speak), Gr. $\phi \dot{a}-\tau \iota \varsigma, \phi \eta-\mu i$, $\phi a^{\imath} \nu \omega, \phi a ́-o s$, L. fa-ma, fa-ri, fa-teor, fa-cies, fav-illa, \&c. G is lost before $m$ in fulmen for fulgmen, flamen for flagmen beside Skr. bhrâg' (to shine), Gr. $\phi \lambda \varepsilon ́ \gamma \omega, \phi \lambda o ́ \xi$, L. flagro, fulgeo, fulvus (for fulgvus), \&c.; frumentum beside fruges; rumino for rugmino beside Gr. ępvoíl (a vomiting), L. ructo, erūgo, used by Ennius in the line contempsit fontes quibu' sese erugit aquae vis ; stimulus for stigmulus beside Skr. tig' (to be sharp), Z. tighri (an arrow), Gr. $\sigma \tau i \zeta \omega$, , $\sigma$ í $\gamma \mu a$, L. distinguo, instigo; umor, umecto for ugmor, ugmecta from I. E. ug, whence Skr. uksh, Gr. íqoós ; fames, according to Bopp, for fagmes beside Skr. bhaksh (to eat), Gr. ${ }^{\ell}-\phi a \gamma-o v$, L. faba (for fagva ?), but Curtius rejects this account of fames on the ground that a nominal suffix cannot signify desire ; exämen from exago; contamino beside tango, R. tag.

Initial $h$ is lost in olus =holus = folus; aedus $=$ haedus $=$ faedus ; ircus $=$ hircus $=$ fircus ; er $=$ her (a hedgehog) $=$ Gr.

[^61] O. H. G. gans; arvina (lard) beside Skr. (Ved.) hirâa (intes-
 (entrails), hilla for hirula; \&c.* $H$ is lost before $l$ in lūtum whence lūteus (yellow), hlūu being $=\chi^{\lambda \omega}$ in Gr. $\chi \lambda \omega$ - oós (yellow); the root of this word was probably an I. E. ghar (to shine) whence on one side came Skr. hirana, hiranya (gold), Z. zaranu, zaranya (gold), Gr. גৎvoós, גৎvoíov, Goth. gulth, Ch. Sl. zlato, and on another, Skr. hari (green, yellow), Z. zairi (yellow), Gr. $\chi \lambda$ ó $\eta, \chi \lambda$ óos, $\chi \lambda \omega \rho o ́ s, ~ L . ~ h e l u s, ~ h o l u s, ~ f l a-~$ vus, helvus, O. H. G. grōni, crōni (green), Ch. Sl. zelije (olera), Lith. želiù (viresco), Ir. glas (green) : Bopp connects viridis with Skr. harit, supposing that gviridis was the original form, but all the forms in the cognate languages point back to a root ghar and not ghvar.

Medial $h$ is lost in $m i=m i h i$; nemo for nehemo ; nil $=n i$ hil ; vemens $=$ vehemens ; Ala $=$ Ahala; cors = cohors ; debeo =dehibeo; praebeo $=$ praehibeo; aenum $=$ ahenum ; pius beside Volsc. pihom (pium), U. pilıaclu (piaculum) ; via, vea for veha from reho; prendo = prehendo for praehendo, praeda for prae-hid-a, both from R. hed = I. E. ghad whence Skr. hasta (manus) for had-ta (?), Gr. रavס́áv $\omega$, $\bar{\xi}-\chi a \delta{ }^{\prime}-o v$, L. hasta for had-ta, hěd-era (the "clinging" shrub), Goth. bi-git-an (to find), E. get ; bīmus for bihimus $\dagger$ (so trīmus, quadrīmus, \&c.) beside Skr. hima (snow) Z. hima (a year), zima (winter), Gr. $\chi \varepsilon \not \mu \omega \dot{\nu}, \chi \iota \omega \dot{\nu}$, L. hiems, Ch. Sl. zima (hiems); lana perhaps for lahna = Gr. $\lambda a ́ \chi \nu \eta$; aranea for arahnea beside Gr. á $\rho a ́ \chi \nu \eta$ from I. E. ark (to spin) whence Gr. ăøкия, àркávך (a thread, seam), $\dot{\eta} \lambda a \kappa a ́ \tau \eta ; ~ v e l u m ~ f o r ~ v e h l u m ~ b e s i d e ~ v e x i l l u m ~ f r o m ~ v e h o . ~$

Initial $j$ is lost in uxor beside conjux from jungo. Some connect uxor $\ddagger$ with Skr. vas (to wish for), vas'áa (a woman), Gr.

[^62]$\varepsilon \kappa \omega \dot{v}$. Pott has suggested two explanations of the word, both equally wrong, (1) uxor = "she who is carried off" from vah (to carry) and suffix -tor, but a passive sense never coexists with this suffix, (2) uxor = "ducta femina" from Skr. vah + strî (a woman).

Medial $j(y)$ is lost in domo for domayo $=$ Skr. damayâmi, amo for amayo, \&c.; doceo for doceyo, \&c.; audio for audiyo, \&c.; doceam, doceyam, \&c.; audiam = audiyam, \&c.; ferreus $=$ ferreyus, aureus $=$ aureyus, \&c.; liga, quadriga for bijuga, quadrijuga ; cuncti for cojuncti ; hornus for hoyornus, yor- corresponding to Z. yâre (a year), Gr. $\left.\begin{array}{c} \\ \rho a\end{array}\right)$ E. year ; minor for minyor, minus for minyus, the comparative terminations -ior, -ius being = I. E. -yâns, -yas, Skr. -îyâns, -iyas; O. L. plous (plus) for ployus, pleores (plures, Carm. Arv.) for pleyores; pris- (in pris-tinus, pris-cus) = prius for proyos; ero for esyo
 -bus (term. of dat. pl.) = Skr. -bhyas.

Initial $t$ is lost in lätus for tlatus beside tollo, O. L. tulo, \&c.
Medial $t$ is lost in ac for atc =atque ; misi for mitsi from mitto ; lens for lents $=$ lentis, mens for ments $=$ mentis, sors for sorts $=$ sortis, \&c. ; primas $=0$. L. primatis, optimas $=0 . \mathrm{L}$. optimatis, Samnis = O. L. Samnitis, Tiburs = O. L. Tiburtis, \&c.; miles for milets, beside milit-em ; quartus for quat(u)rtus.

Initial $d$ is lost in Juppiter, Jovis, U. Jupater beside O. L. Diovis, O. $\Delta \iota o v \mathrm{~F}_{\varepsilon \iota}$ (dat.), \&c.; viginti for dviginti.

Medial $d$ is lost in hoc for hode; corculum for cordculum; pēs for pĕds; suäsi for suädsi; frons = frondis; concors = concordis; glans for glands; māno for madno beside Gr. $\mu a \delta a ́ \omega$ (madeo), L. măd-idus, \&c.; mercenarius for mercednarius; finis for fidnis beside findo from R. fid=Skr. bhid (findere), E. bite; scalae for scadlae beside scando, Skr. skand (scandere) ; suävis for suädvis, Gr. ท̂dús, \&c.; squāma for squădma from I. E. skad (to cover) beside Skr. k'had (tegere), l'hadman. (occultatio, alienae formae assumptio), perhaps sku (tegere), Gr. бкотós, бкı́́, $\sigma \kappa \eta \nu \eta ́, G o t h . ~ s k i l d u s$ (a shield), skalja (tegula), Ir. scath
(shade), \&c.; caementum beside caedo ; ramentum beside rado. The prefixes sëd-(sed-itio), rěd- (red-eo, red-igo, redi-vivus),* prōd- (prōd-esse, pröd-eo, prōd-igus) lose their final $d$ before a consonant, as in sēgrego, sējugo, sèduco, sēvoco, rěducor, rĕpono, rëmoveo, prōduco, prōmitto, \&c.

Initial $s$ is lost in cutis for scutis beside Skr. sku (to cover), Gr. $\boldsymbol{\kappa u ̈ r o s , ~ к и ́ т o \varsigma , ~ L . ~ o b - s c u - r u s , ~ s c u - t u m , ~ L i t h . ~ s k u r a ̀ ~ ( s k i n ) , ~}$ A. S. hūd (a hide); caveo, cautus from R. skav beside Skr. kavi (wise, a poet), Gr. Өvo-бкóo:s, кó $\varepsilon \omega$, кovvé $\omega$ (I perceive)
 ( ${ }_{2} \sigma \theta o \mu \varepsilon \theta a$, Hesych.), Goth. us-skav-jan (to be cautious), skaus (cautious), skauns (beautiful), O. H. G. scawōn (to look), G. schauen, schön ; caedo for scaedo beside Skr. k'hid (to tear, cut)
 splinter), L. scindo, Goth. skaida (I separate), O. H. G. sceit (discissio), O.N. skīd (lignum fissum); cena for cesna $=$ ced-na for sced-na from I. E. skad (to eat, lit. to cut, cleave) whence Skr. khâd (to eat) ; cedo may be also connected with last root
 Hesych.), кท̄ठos, \&c., the idea of cutting asunder being closely connected with that of separation, and then with that of sorrow; capis (a vessel) from St. capid $=$ O. U. kapir, capulum (the hilt of a sword, a bier), capedo, capisterium, \&c., if Froehde, Corssen, $\dagger$ and others be correct in connecting these words with Gr. бкафís, бка́фŋ (a basin, skiff), бка́ттш, ка́тєтоৎ (a trench), Ch. Sl. kopati (fodere), Lith. kápas (a grave), Goth. skip (a ship), ga-skap-jan (to make), G. schoppen (a scoop), schaufel (a shovel), \&c.; but it is much preferable to connect capis, \&c., with L. capio, capax, Gr. к $\dot{\pi} \pi \eta$ whence was borrowed L. cupa, Goth. hafja (I lift), M. H. G. laft (vinculum), E. heave, haft, \&c.; tego, tegula, \&c., for stego, \&c., beside Skr. sthag (to cover), Gr. $\sigma \tau_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \gamma \omega$, $\sigma \tau^{\varepsilon} \hat{\gamma}$ os, $\tau^{\varepsilon} \gamma \mathbf{\gamma}$ os, L. istega (a cover)

[^63] R. div.
† Consult Corssen's Nachträge, \&c., p. 293, and K. Z. xiii. 452.
for instega, Lith. stogas (a roof), O. N. thek (a roof), O.H. G. dakju (I cover), E. thatch, deck; tundo, tudes (a hammer), \&c., for stundo, \&c., beside Skr. tud (to strike), Gr. Tvס́vís, Goth. stauta (I strike), O. H. G. stōzu ; torus for storus beside Skr. star (sternere), Gr. $\sigma \tau o ́ \rho \nu v \mu l, ~ \sigma \tau \rho a \tau o ́ s, ~ \& c ., ~ L . ~ s t e r n o, ~ s t r a m e n, ~$ \&c., Goth. strauja ( $\sigma \tau \varrho \omega ́ v \nu v \mu \iota$ ), O. H. G. strāo (straw), Ch. Sl. strěti (extendere); Corssen supposes that initial $s$ is also lost in littera, linea, limus, lino beside O. H. G. slim, G. schleim (slime) ; nurus for snurus, beside Skr. snushâ, Gr. vvós, O. H. G. snur, A. S. snor, Ch. Sl. snoch $\bar{a}$; na-re, na-ta-re, nā-sus for sna-re, \&c., beside Skr. snâ (lavare), Gr. $\nu \bar{\eta} \sigma o s, ~ N a ́ \xi o s ; ~$ nix for snix beside Z. s'nizh (to snow), Gr. á $\gamma a ́ v \nu ı \phi o s ~ f o r ~$
 snĕgŭ (snow); nutrix beside Skr. snu (to flow), according to Corssen who explains it to mean "the person who makes to flow," viz. " milk," as stator signifies " the person who causes to stand;" repo for srepo beside L. serpo, Skr. sarpa (a serpent) ; rete for srete from sero beside Skr. sarit (a thread), Gr. $\sigma \varepsilon i \rho a$, घi $\rho \omega$, $\varepsilon_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \rho \mu a$, Lith. seris (a thread) ; rivus, Rumo (an old name of the Tiber), rumen (the udder), Rumina beside Skr. sru (to flow), Gr. $\rho_{o ́-o s, ~}^{\rho} \varepsilon \tilde{v}-\mu a, \rho \in v-\theta-\mu o ́ s, ~ \& c ., ~ O . ~ H . ~ G . ~ s t r o u m ~(a ~$ stream), Lith. sravju (I flow); palea (chaff), pulvis, pollen from I. E. R. spar (to move quickly), when Skr. sphurâmi (vibror), palâla (straw), Z. s'par (to go), Gr. $\sigma \pi a i \rho \omega, \dot{a} \sigma \pi a i \varrho \rho \omega$, $\sigma \pi \varepsilon i \rho \omega, \sigma \pi a \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \pi a-\sigma \pi a ́ \lambda-\eta$ (fine meal) $=\pi a 1-\pi a ́ \lambda-\eta, \pi a-$ $\lambda \dot{v} \nu \omega, \pi a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega, \pi a ́ \lambda \eta$ (pollen), \&c., O. H. G. sprua (chaff), spor (vestigium), sporōn (calcitrare), spurnan (offendere), E. spurn, L. sperno, Lith. spirti (to push), \&c. ; pituita for spituita beside spuo, spu-tum from I. E. spyu beside Skr. shṭ̂v (spuere), $\pi \tau \boldsymbol{v} \omega$ for $\sigma \pi y v \omega, \psi \dot{\tau} \tau \tau-\omega, \pi v \tau-i \zeta \omega$ for $\pi \tau v-\pi \tau \iota-\zeta \omega$, a frequentative form, Goth. speiva (spuo), O.H. G. spiuvan, spīhan (to spit), Lith. spiáu-ju (I spit), \&c.; fallo, fides, funda, fungus beside
 beside Skr. smar (to remember), smara (love), Gr. $\mu \notin \rho-\mu \eta \rho-a$, $\mu \hat{\rho} \rho-t-\mu \nu a, \mu a ́ \rho \tau v \rho, \& c . \quad$ St is lost before $l$ in lātus = O. L. stlāa-
tus beside sterno, \&c.; lis for stlis beside O. H. G. strit, G. streit (a fight); locus for stlocus beside Skr. sthala (a place), from sthal, a secondary root formed from sthâ: Bopp, however, connects locus with Skr. lôka (mundus), Lith. laukas (campus).

Medial $s$ is lost between two vowels in viola for visola beside Skr. visha (poison), Gr. iós, ỉov, L. virus, Benfey remarks, "poison is connected with blue, cf. visha-pushpa (the blue lotus), and S'iva's neck growing blue, by swallowing the poison churned out of the sea;" Cerealis for Ceresalis beside Ceres, Cereris; Ramnes, Tities, Luceres for Ramneses, Titieses Lucereses; spei for spesi beside speres (nom. pl.in Ennius); ver for veser beside Skr. vas-anta (ver), Gr. éap for Fєoap, Lith. vas-ara (summer), Ch. Sl. ves-na (ver), O. N. vär (ver) ; vīs perhaps for visis beside vires, virium ; diēs perhaps for diesis beside diur-nus, Dies-piter, ho-dier-nus, Skr. divas-a (day), Divas-pati (the lord of day, i. e. Indra) ; nūbēs perhaps for nubĕsis beside Skr. nabhas (nom. neut.), Gr. עé申os, vé申є( $\sigma$ )-os, Lith. débesis (nubes) ; sēdēs perhaps for sēdesis beside Skr. sadas (nom. neut.) = Gr. ${ }^{\text {édos }}$; and perhaps some other cases like nubes and sedes. Medial $s$ is lost before consonants in the following cases:-digredior for disgredior; dijudico for disjudico; träjicio for transjicio ; diduco for disduco; trāduco, trādo beside transduco, transdo; īdem for isdem; judex for jusdex; nīdus for nisdus, E. nest; prīdie, prīdem for prisdie, prisdem; audio perhaps for ausdio beside aus-culto, aur-is, Gr. oṽs, Lith. ausìs (the ear); cena for cesna ; pono for posno beside pos-ui; aeneus for aesneus; satin for satisne; audin for audisne; pōne (behind) for posne; $\bar{a} n u s$ for asnus beside Skr. âsana (a seat), âste = Gr. ${ }^{2} \sigma \tau a \iota$, \&c.; peēnis for pesnis beside Skr. pasas (penis), Gr. $\pi$ ŕos, $\pi$ ó $\sigma-$ $\theta \eta ;$ fanum for fasnum $=0$. fiesnu beside fes-tus, fer-iae, Gr. $\theta \varepsilon \sigma-\sigma a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu o \iota, \& c$. ; canus for casnus, but Bopp considers that the original form of the root was skan whence Skr. kan (splendere), Goth. skeina (I shine) ; vēnum for vesnum beside Skr. vasna (price) ; corpulentus for corpuslentus; quälus (a basket),
beside quasillus ; diligo for disligo; tenebrae for tenesbrae; dimitto for dismitto; rēmus for resmus = retmus, Gr. द̀ $\rho \varepsilon \tau \mu o ́ s ;$ Cămena for Casmena beside carmen, Skr. s'âs (to say, teach), $s^{\prime}$ âns (to praise), with which Benfey connects censeo, cano, con-cinn-us,* but the two latter words belong to Skr. kvan (sonare) ; pomoerium for pos-moerium ; dumus beside dusmus (incultus, dumosus), densus, Gr. $\delta a \sigma u ́ s, ~ \delta a v \lambda o ́ s ~ f o r ~ \delta a \sigma v \lambda o s, ~ ' E \pi i-\delta a v-~$
 and sex, as we have already seen, become $e$ - and $s e-$ in composition, except before $c, t, p$; thus we have egero, educo, sedecim, \&c., but extendo, expello, \&c.

Medial $n$ is lost before $g n$ in ignavus, ignarus, ignoro, cognatus, cognatus, \&c.; signum is connected by Ebel with Skr. sang'na (sign, name), and therefore stands for singnum, sinbeing found also in sin-guli, sin-cerus, simplex and -gnu-m being from R. gn $\bar{o}=$ Skr. g'nâ (to know). The preposition con ( $=c o m$ ) frequently loses its final $n$ before $h, j, v$, and $s$ in composition; thus we find cohibeo, coicio, cojunx, coventio, cosol, \&c. $\quad N$ is lost before $s$ in istega for instega (deck), isculponeae from insculpo, intresecus beside intrinsecus. In Umbrian we likewise find kuveitu $=\mathrm{L}$. convehito. kuvertu $=\mathrm{L}$. convertito, covortust $=\mathrm{L}$. converterit, \&c.

Medial $r$ is lost in rubigo for rubrigo from ruber; pejero for perjero; sempiternus from semper ; pēdo, podex beside Skr. pard, Gr. $\pi \varepsilon \rho \delta \delta \omega ;$ sūsum $=$ sursum, \&c. ; tostus for torstus from torreo ; fuscus for furscus beside fur-vus ; formosus for formonsus; retrōsum beside retrorsum ; Tuscus for Turscus = Etruscus, beside O. U. Turskum, N. U. Tuscom: Etru-s-cus $\dagger$ being formed from U. etru- (alter) as pri-s-cus from pri=prae, $-s$ being the remains of the comparative termination -ius, Etrusci therefore meant exteri "the strangers" in Umbrian.

* Lottner connects con-cin-nus with cin-cin-nus, in which case the root must have meant " to connect, to twist."
$\dagger$ Consult Corssen, Über Ausprache, \&c, vol. i., p. 92, and his Kritische Nachträge, \&c., p. 177.

Medial $l$ appears to be lost in cingere $=$ clingere $($ Fest. 56) beside O. H. G. hring (a ring).

Initial $p$ is perhaps lost before $r$ in red beside Skr. prati, Gr. moori. It is lost before $l$ in lien beside Skr. plihan (lien), Gr. $\sigma \pi \lambda \dot{\eta} \nu, \sigma \pi \lambda a ́ \gamma \chi^{\nu o \nu}$; laetus for plaitus beside Skr. prî (to love, to rejoice) ; lanx beside Gr. $\pi \lambda a ́ \xi$, L. planca (a plate), plänus for placnus (?), O.H. G. flah; lătus, Latium beside Skr. prath (to extend), prthu (broad), Gr. $\pi \lambda a \tau$ ús, $\pi \lambda$ áros, L. planta (sole of the foot), plänus for platnus (?), plautus for plotus, (planis pedibus, Fest. 239); later (a tile), which is perhaps connected with last root; linter or lunter beside Gr. $\pi \lambda v \nu \tau \eta{ }_{\rho} \rho$ from R. $\pi \lambda v$ whence $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \omega$. The connexion of lavo with R. $\pi \lambda v$ is very doubtful; it is better to connect it directly with Gr. R. $\lambda v$ whence $\lambda \bar{\nu} \mu a, \lambda o u \tau \rho o ́ v, ~ \& c$. Pott also connects
 pli, Lett. alwa; but this too is very doubtful.

Medial $b$ is lost in sus $=$ subs in suscipio, sustuli, susque, surgo for susrigo; surpio beside subripio ; oportet for obportet, beside pars, portio; operio for obperio beside a-perio ; opimus for obpimus beside Skr. pyâi (crescere), pîvara (crassus), Gr. $\pi i \omega \nu, \pi i ̄ a \rho o ́ s, \pi \iota \mu \bar{c} \lambda \eta$.

Initial $f$ is perhaps lost in rigeo, rigor, rigidus beside Gr.


Medial $f$ is lost, according to Corssen, in illim, istim, \&c., for illo-fim, isto-fim, \&c., - fim being = Skr. -bhyam.

Initial $v$ is lost in olla (a pot), for vorula from I. E. var (to boil), whence Gr. $\beta \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega, \beta \rho \rho^{\prime} \zeta \omega$ (I boil), O. H. G. walm (fervor), Ch. Sl. veěti (fervere), Lith. virrti (to boil), \&c.; odi beside Skr. vadh (to strike), Gr. $\dot{\omega} \theta \hat{\epsilon} \omega$; orno beside Skr. varna (colour). In these cases $a$ becomes $o$ on account of the preceding $v$. Initial $v$ is also lost in rigo beside Gr. $\beta \rho^{\prime} \chi \omega$, Goth. rign ( $(\beta \rho o \chi \eta$ й) from I. E. vragh ; repente, repens, repentinus be-
 ter), radix beside Gr. pí $\langle$, Lesb. $\beta \rho i \sigma \delta a$, Goth. vaurts (a root),
O. H. G. wurzala, wurza; ros perhaps for vros beside Skr.
 Goth. vruggō (a noose); lacer, lacus, lacinia beside Skr. vras'k'
 кos) which points back to a root Foak, Benfey connects Gr. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\prime \prime} \lambda_{\kappa o \varsigma}$, L. ulcus, with this root; lacio beside Gr. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \lambda \kappa \omega$ from R. $\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\kappa}$, Lith. velkì (I pull), with which Corssen connects laqueus ; lupus,* Sabine irpus, beside Skr. vrkas (nom. sing. masc.), Gr. גúkos, Goth. vulfs, Ch. Sl. vlǜkŭ, Lith. vilkas, connected by some with Skr. vras'k' (to tear), and by others with an I. E vrak, whence Gr. ${ }^{〔} \lambda_{\kappa \omega} \omega$; lana perhaps for vlana beside Skr. var (to cover), ûrṇa (wool), urubhra (a ram, lit. the
 ßa@víov (åovíov Hesych.), ßáoııoı (ảpvєs Hesych.), L. vellus, villus, Goth. vulla (wool), Lith. vilna (wool), Ch. Sl. vlüna (wool).

Medial $v$ is often lost between vowels as in suus $=0 . L$. sovos $=\mathrm{Gr}$. éós ; tuus for tovos $=\mathrm{Gr} . \tau$ гós ; momentum for movimentum ; ploro for plovero from R. plu, according to Corssen; domui, habui, \&c., for domavi, habevi, \&c.; mox for movox from moveo ; Mars for Mavors; nuntius for noviventius ; praes for praeves, the plural of which, praevides, is found in Thorian law, from prae and vas; junior for juvenior ; mursum for revorsum ; nosse $=$ novisse, \&c.; amaram $=$ amaveram ; \&c.; audisti $=$ audivisti, \&c.; nolo for nevolo; \&c. $V$ is lost after $c$ in canis beside Skr. s'van (a dog), Gr. кú $\omega \boldsymbol{v}$; cano beside Skr. $k v a n$ (to sound) : and after $s$ in $s i$ ( $=$ O. svai), se, sibi, sed from St. sva; somnus = Skr. svapnas, Gr. v̈ $\pi v o s ;$ soror $=$ Skr. svas $\hat{a}$, Goth. svistar ; sodalis from a lost stem sodā beside Skr. svadhâ

[^64]（the will，properly＂one＇s own action＂from sva and dhâ），${ }^{*}$
 proving that the root originally contained F，L．suesco，Goth． sidus（ $\tilde{\eta} \theta \circ \mathrm{s}$ ），G．sitte（custom）；sonus beside Skr．svan（to sound）；socer $=$ Skr．s＇vas＇uras，Gr．ékvoós；socrus $=$ Skr． s＇vas＇rûs ；sermo perhaps for svermo beside Skr．svar（to sound）， Gr．$\sigma \tilde{\rho} \rho \iota \xi \xi$, L．susurrus，absurdus（compare absonus）；serenus， sol beside Skr．svar（heaven），Z．hvarĕ（sol），Gr．Dદípıos，$\sigma \varepsilon \in-$ $\lambda a \varsigma, ~ \sigma \varepsilon \lambda \eta \eta \eta$ ．

Initial $m$ is lost in imago and imitor for mimago and mimi－ tor beside Skr．mâ（to measure），mimatê（imitantur），Gr．$\mu \dot{\varepsilon}-$ $\tau \rho o \nu, \mu t-\mu \varepsilon ⿱ 亠 䒑 𧰨-o \mu \alpha \iota, \mu i-\mu \eta-\sigma \iota \varsigma, \mu i-\mu o-\varsigma$.

Corssen connects imitor and imago with a Latin root ic $=$ I．E．ak，whence G．ah－men，L．aequus，and considers their original forms to have been icmitor，icmago．

## §．85．The Insertion of a Consonant．

$P$ is inserted between $m$ and a following dental，as in hiemps， emptus，sumpsi，sumptus，contempsi，contemptus，\＆c．$S$ is in－ serted in mon－s－trum（from same root as maneo，moneo，mens， \＆c．，and－trum），lu－s－trum（from same root as luo，di－luv－ium， lav－0，\＆c．，and－trum），abstineo，ostendo for obstendo，sustineo for substineo．

## §．86．Final Consonants．

The combinations $r s, l s, n s$ ，are in general never allowed to end a word，except when they represent rts，lts，nts ；thus we have ferens，amans，\＆c．，for ferents，amants，\＆c．，puls for pults，\＆c．，but puer for puer（u）s，vir for vir（u）s，quatuor for quatuor（e）s，vigil for vigil（i）s，novōs（acc．pl．）for novons and similar accusatives，sāl for săls．We have，however，fers for feris．

[^65]Double consonants are never allowed to end a word: thus we have os (oss-is) for oss- =ost- ; fel (fell-is) for fell-= felt-; novōs for novoss $=$ novons, novas for novass $=$ novans, \&c., while in Old Oscan the acc. pl. still ends in $-s s$, as viass $=\mathrm{L}$. vias, \&c.; damnas for damnass = damnat $(u) s$, compare $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. pihaz, N. U. pihos = L. piatus, O. U. taçez, N. U. taçes = L. tacetus, O. O. hirr = L. hortus, \&c.

Two mutes are not allowed to end a word: thus we have lac for lact (lact-is).

Final $t$ was frequently lost: thus we find in Old Latin dede (dedit), dedro (dederunt), \&c.; in Classical Latin the double form of the 3 pl. perf. fecere and fecerunt, \&c.; in late Latin such forms as vixse (vixit), quiesce (quiescit), fecerun (fecerunt), \&c. In Umbrian such forms are common: thus we find habe (habet), façia (faciat), fuia (fuat), portaia (portet), benus (venerit), convortus beside convortust (converterit), benuso (venerunt), \&c. In Oscan $t$ is retained, as in fust (fuerit), fefacust (O. L. faxit), hipust (0. L. habessit), \&c.

Final $d$ was also frequently lost: thus in abl. sing. we find patre (t. Scip. Barb.) beside Gnaivod and in Classical Latin this abl. - $d$ was universally lost, while it was retained in Oscan, as in suvad (suā), ehtrad (extra), toutad (civitate), castrid (castro), \&c. Similarly $d$ was lost in the imperatives esto, agito, \&c., beside Osc. estud, actud, \&c.

In Old Latin $s$ was frequently lost after a vowel, as in Tetio, Albanio, \&c., for Tetios, Albanios, \&c.; Corneli for Cornelis, and this again for Cornelios, \&c.; in Classical Latin we also find mage beside magis, pote beside potis, laudare beside laudaris, \&c. Final $s$ was also lost in the nom. pl. of the $o$-stems, and in the gen. sing. of the $a$-stems, as in $h i=0 . \mathrm{L}$. heis, magistri $=$ O. L. magistreis, familiae $=$ familias, \&c. In Oscan and Umbrian $s(\mathrm{~N} . \mathrm{U} . r)$ is retained in these cases, as in O. U. urtas (ortae), tutas (totae), N. U. screihtor (scripti), totcor (tutici), totar (totae), motar (multae, poenae), O. O. Nüvlanus (Nolani), N. O. pas (quae), scriftas (scriptae), \&c.

Final $n$ was sometimes omitted as in ceteroqui, alioqui for ceteroquin, alioquin, and in nominatives in -0 as virgo, caligo, \&c.

Final $m$ in Old Latin was frequently omitted as in the conjunctive forms attinge, dice, \&c., for attingam, dicam, \&c.; also in the following examples from the Epitaphs of the Scipios Taurasia (acc. sing.), Samnio (acc. sing.), oino (unum), duonoro (bonorum), urbe (urbem), \&c. ; in Classical Latin $m$ before a vowel in verse was elided.


## CHAPTER VII.

## Roots and Stems.

§. 87. The root* of a word is that portion of it that remains when everything formative and accidental has been removed from it. Thus the root of L. pater, Gr. $\pi a r i ́ \rho, ~ S k r . ~$ pit $\hat{a}$ (nom. sing.) is $p a=$ Skr. $p \hat{a}$ (to support), L. $-t e r, \mathrm{Gr} .-\tau \eta \rho$, Skr. -tar being the same suffix that appears in L. mater, \&c.; the root of elementum is $e l$, $e$ being a connecting vowel and - mentu- $m$ the same suffix that appears in rudi-mentu- $m$; the root of $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau i \theta_{\varepsilon \tau o}$ is $\theta \varepsilon, \dot{\varepsilon}$ being the augment signifying past time, $\tau \iota$ the reduplication signifying duration, and $\tau \sigma$ the sign of the 3rd pers. sing. ; similarly the root of $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma^{i} \gamma \nu \varepsilon \tau o$ for $\dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \iota \gamma \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \tau \circ$ is $\gamma \varepsilon \nu$; the root of $\zeta_{\varepsilon} \dot{\gamma} \gamma \nu v \mu \iota$ is $\zeta_{v \gamma}$ for $\nu v$ and $\mu \iota$ are formative elements, the first signifying present time, and the second the first pers. sing., while $\varepsilon v$ is the guna of $v$, and $\varepsilon$ is consequently merely an accidental element; $\dagger$ similarly the root of $\lambda \varepsilon \lambda^{\prime} \circ \iota \pi a$ is $\lambda_{\iota \pi}$. In the above remarks I have used the word root in its ordinary signification as representing that portion of the

* Max Müller (Lectures, \&c., II., p. 81) calls " root or radical whatever, in the words of any language or family of languages, cannot be reduced to a simpler or a more original form." The Indian Grammarians called a root dhâtu from dhâ (to nourish); dhâtu means any primary or elementary substance, and consequently shows that these grammarians looked upon roots as the primary elements, the constituent parts of words. We generally translate roots by the infinitive, as this gives the most abstract idea of the word. The Indian Grammarians, however, represent them by abstract substantives in the Locative, as gam (to go) by gatau (in going) ; Bopp's Skr. Gram., p. 69.
$\dagger$ Consult Curtius, Grundzüge, \&e., p. 49 seq., and Bopp's Comparative Grammar, vol. I., p. 197.
word which contains the fundamental idea; but properly speaking, every Indo-European word consists of two or more roots: thus Skr. asmi $(\mathrm{I} \mathrm{am})=\mathrm{Gr}$. sipi consists of the two roots as (to be) and $m i=m a(\mathrm{I})$; Skr. blarâmi $(\mathrm{I}$ bear $)=\mathrm{Gr}$. $\phi \hat{\rho} \rho \omega$, consists of the three roots bhar (to bear), as (to be)* and $m i(\mathrm{I})$; Skr. bharati (he bears) $=$ Gr. $\phi \hat{\rho} \rho \varepsilon \iota$ for $\phi € \varrho \varepsilon \tau \iota$ consists of the three roots blar, $a$ (a demonstrative root) and $t i$ (the pronoun of 3rd pers. sing.) ; Gr. ö $\psi=$ L. vox $=$ I. E. valis when Skr. vâk (nom. sing.) comes from the two roots vak (to speak $)=$ Skr. vach and sa (a demonstrative root), \&cc. In the earliest period of the I. E. language, long before any separation of the dialects occurred, roots existed as independent words, exactly as in Chinese at the present day; thus the words, just discussed, probably existed then as as ma, bhar as ma, bhar ata, vak sa. There never was a period, however, in the history of Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, or any other I. E. language, after their separation from the parent stock and from each other, when roots existed as actual words. No exception to this statement is formed by such imperatives as dic, fac, \&c., for these are merely shortened forms of dice, face, \&ce., nor by such vocatives as vâk from St. vâk (voice) from R. vale, for a vocative is not properly a word, but rather an interjection, nor by words which in the process of time appear only as roots on account of the loss of their terminations.
§. 88. All Indo-European roots are monosyllabic, and this is the only law to which they are subject. We consequently find as roots the following combinations of vowels and consonants:-
I. (Spiritus lenis + ) Vowel : I. E. $i$ (to go) $=$ Skr., Z., Gr., L., Goth., Lith., Ch. Sl. $i$ (to go), as Skr. êmi (I go) = Gr. $\varepsilon i \mu u=$ Lith. eimì, L. eo, Skr. imas (we go) $=$ Gr. $i^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu$, L. imus (the $\bar{\imath}$ of which seems to point to a root $\bar{i}$ ); Skr. $u$ (to sound)
* I assume here that bharâmi is for bhar-as-mi (to bear am I, i. e. I bear) : the second syllable may, however, be the only demonstrative root $a$ lengthened to $\hat{a}$.
is given by the grammarians ; L. $u$ is found in ind-u-ere, ex-u-ere.
II. Cons.+vowel : I. E. $d a$ (to give), Skr., Z. $d \hat{a}$ (to give), Skr. dadâmi $=$ Gr. $\delta i ́ \delta \omega \mu t$, Skr. $d \hat{a} t \hat{a}$ (nom. sing. from St. $d \hat{\alpha}-$
 tor, L. dăre, dōnum, \&c.; I. E. pa (to guard), Skr. pâ (id.), pati-s (nom. sing., a master), patn̂̂ (a mistress), Gr. móбıç,
 $d h a$ (to place), Skr. $d h \hat{a}$ (id.), Z. $d \hat{a}$ (id.), Gr. $\theta \varepsilon \varepsilon-\mu a, \tau_{i}^{\prime}-\theta \eta-\mu t=$ Skr. dadhâmi, \&c.; I. E. ki (to lie), Skr. s'̂̂ (id.), s'êtê = Gr. кєïtal, L. civis (= Osc. cevs), quiesco, \&e.
III. Vowel + cons.: I. E. ak (to be sharp, quick), Skr. $a s^{\prime}-r i$ (point of a sword), âs'-us = Gr. $\dot{\omega} \kappa v_{s}, a s^{\prime}-v a s=$ L. eq-uus, Gr. äк- $\rho о \varsigma$, äк $-\omega \nu$, L. $a c-e r, a c-u-o, \bar{a} c-e r, \bar{o} c-i o r$; I. E. $a p$ (to obtain), Skr. âp (id.), L. ad-ip-iscor, aptus = Skr. âptas; I. E. $a d$ (to eat), Skr. $a d$ (id.), Gr. ${ }_{\delta \delta} \delta-\omega$, L. ed-o; I. E. as (to be),

IV. Cons. + vowel + cons. : I. E. bhugh (to fly, bend),
 $=\phi v \delta y a$ for $\phi v \gamma y a$, L. fugio, \&c.; I. E. lip (to smear), Skr. lip (id.), Gr. $\lambda_{i \pi} \pi-a$ (fat), $\dot{a}-\lambda \varepsilon i \phi-\omega, \& c . ;$ I. E. pak (to bind), Skr. and Z. pas' (id.), Gr. $\pi a ́ \gamma-o s, \pi a ́ \sigma \sigma a \lambda o s=\pi a к y a \lambda o s, ~ L . ~ p a x, ~$ pig-nus, compesco = com-pec-sco, \&c.; I. E. bhudh (to know), Skr. budh (id.), Z. bud (id.), Gr. $\pi v \nu \theta-a ́ v o \mu a \iota, ~ \& c$.
V. Cons. + cons. + vowel : I. E. kru (to hear), Skr. s'ru (id.), Gr. $\kappa \lambda \dot{v}-\omega$, L. clu-o, cli-ens; I. E. plu (to swim), Skr. $p l u$ (id.), Gr. $\pi \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}-\omega, \pi \lambda \varepsilon v ́-\sigma o \mu a \iota, \pi \lambda o^{-o-s}$, L. plu-it, \&c.; I. E. pri (to love), Skr. prî (id.), Z. frî (id.), Gr. $\pi \rho \underline{a}{ }^{\circ}{ }_{c}$ for $\pi \rho a y-o-s$, $\pi \rho a u ̛ ́ s$ for $\pi \rho a y-v-s ;$ I. E. sta (to stand), Skr. sthâ (id.), Z. $s^{\prime} t \hat{a}$ (id.), Gr. $\sigma \tau \dot{\alpha}-\sigma \iota s$, L. stă-tus; I. E. gva (to go), Skr. g'i-gâ-mi (I go), Gr. $\beta a i l \nu \omega$ for $\beta a-\nu y \omega$, L. ar-bi-ter.
VI. Vowel + cons. + cons. : Skr. ard (to kill), Gr. ả $\rho \delta-\iota \varsigma$ (point of an arrow) ; I. E. ard (to water) ; Skr. ârd-ra (wet), Gr. äpo- $\omega$ ( 1 water); I. E. argh, Skr. arh (to be worthy), Z. areg' (id.), Gr. ä $\rho \chi^{-\omega}$, ő $\rho \chi-a \mu o s ;$ I. E. $\arg$ (to shine), Skr.

argentum, arg-u-o (I make clear) ; I. E. ark (to shine), Skr. ark' (id.), arka (the sun), Ir. earc (id.) ; I. E. ardh (to grow), Skr. $\operatorname{ardh}$ (id.), Gr. à $\lambda \delta-a i v \omega$, Ir. alt (nursing), according to Bopp.
VII. Cons. + cons. + vowel + cons. : I. E. stigh (to ascend),
 up), O. H. G. stega (semita), Ch. Sl. stǎza (id.) ; I. E. stag (to cover), Skr. sthag (id.), Gr. $\sigma \tau^{\prime} \hat{\gamma}-\omega, \sigma \tau^{\prime} \dot{\gamma}-\eta, \tau^{\xi} \hat{\gamma}-\eta$, L. $i$-steg- $a$ (a deck) for in-steg-a, teg-o, O. N. thek (a roof), O.H. G. dak-ju (I cover) ; I. E. bhrag (to shine), Skr. bhrâg' (id.), Gr. $\phi \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma-\omega$, $\phi \lambda o ́ \xi$, L. fulg-eo, flag-ro, flam-ma ; I. E. stan (to sound), Skr. stan (id.), Gr. $\sigma \tau^{\hat{\varepsilon} \nu \omega} \boldsymbol{\omega}$, L. ton-o, ton-itru, O. N. styn-ja (I groan), O. H. G. stun-ōd (a sigh), E. stun.
VIII. Cons. + vowel + cons. + cons. : I. E. varg, Skr. varg ${ }^{\prime}$ (to exclude), Gr. $\varepsilon i \rho \gamma-\nu v-\mu \ell$, $\mathfrak{\ell} \rho \rho \gamma-\omega$ from R. F $\in \rho \gamma$, L. urg-eo, Goth. vrik-a (I pursue); I. E. marg, Skr. marg' (to wipe, rub), Gr. à $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \hat{\lambda} \gamma-\omega$ (I milk), ó $\mu o ́ \rho \gamma-\nu v-\mu \iota$ (I wipe), L. mulg-eo, O. H. G. milch-u. Benfey connects with this root Gr. $\gamma \lambda$ á $\gamma o s$ (for $\mu \lambda$ aүos), $\gamma$ á $\lambda a$, L. mulier, margo, lac (for mlac); I. E.tars (to dry), Skr. tarsh (to be thirsty), Z. tarsh-na (thirst), Gr т́́ $\rho \sigma-o \mu a t$, L. torr-eo, tos-tus, terr-a, Goth. thaurs-ja (I thirst).
IX. Cons. + cons. + vowel + cons. + cons. : I. E. skand (to move quickly?), Skr. skand (to ascend), Gr. $\sigma$ кáv $\delta-a \lambda o v$, L. scand-o, de-scend-o, Lith. skènd-u (I sink) ; I. E. stambh, Skr stambh (to prop up), Gr. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \mu \phi-v \lambda o v$ (pressed olives), $\dot{a}-\sigma \tau \varepsilon \mu \phi-\eta$ '́s (firm), O. H. G. stamphōn (to stamp), A. S. stemn (mandatum); I. E. sparg (to move quickly), Skr. sparh (to desire), Z. s'parez
 $\sigma \pi \varepsilon ́ \rho \gamma-\delta \eta \nu\left(\dot{\varepsilon} \rho \rho \omega \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime} \omega \omega\right.$, Hesych.) ; I. E. spardh, Skr. spardh (to contend with), Goth. spaurds (arádov), O. H. G. spurt, A. S. spyrd, E. spurt.
§. 89. It is very doubtful whether any roots began or ended with three consonants in Indo-European. When such roots appear in any of the Indo-European languages, either one of the consonants is not original, and merely a late addition to the root, or else the phenomenon arises from transposition. In the following cases the conjunction of the three initial con-
sonants may be original : Gr. $\sigma \tau \rho a ́ \gamma \xi$ (a drop), $\sigma \tau \rho a \gamma \gamma-$-́v́ (I twist), $\sigma \tau \rho \sigma \gamma \gamma-\dot{\lambda} \lambda o s, \sigma \tau \rho a \gamma \gamma-a-\lambda i \xi \omega$ (I strangle), L. string-o, strang-ulo, O. H. G. strangi (strong), from a root strang or strag, signifying "to penetrate, to press," yet the original form of this root may have been starg, whence Gr. taopávau
 oag $\quad$ ávn (a basket), with the loss of $\tau$ as in Ir. sreang-aim (stringo), sreang (a string) ; L. scrof-a (a sow), scribo, scrob-s, Gr. $\gamma \rho \circ \mu \phi$-ác (an old sow), $\gamma \rho a ́ \phi \omega$ may point to an I. E. root skrabh; L. scruta (trash), whence scrutor beside Gr. $\gamma$ Ǿ̣rn (trash) ; Gr. $\sigma \kappa \nu \iota \pi$-ós (stingy) beside $\gamma \nu i ́ \phi \omega \nu(i d$.$) , \&c.$
§. 90. Roots of the form cons. $+a+$ cons. or $a+$ cons. are frequently found in the form [cons. + cons. $+a$ ] or [cons. $+a$ ]: I. E. mar (to ,die) = mra (id.), Skr. mryati (he dies), marta-s (nom. sing. dead), Gr. $\beta$ potós for $\mu \rho o-$ rog, L. morioŕ; I. E. dhar (to bear) $=d h r a$, Skr. dhar (id.), Gr. $\theta_{\rho} \ddot{a}$-vos (a seat), $\theta_{\rho o ́-v o \varsigma, ~}^{\rho \rho \tilde{\eta}-v \omega_{\varrho}(a ~ s t o o l), ~ L . ~ f r e ̄ e t u s, ~ f r e ̄ e n u m, ~ f i r-m u s ; ~}$ I. E. dhar (to sound) = dhra, Skr. dhârâ (vox), Gr. $\theta_{\rho} \hat{\varepsilon}-\mathrm{o} \mu \mathrm{a} t$,
 I. E. man (to think) = mna, Skr. man (id.), Gr. $\mu \mathrm{k}-\mu \circ v-a$,
 gan (to know) = gna, Skr. gñâ (to know), Gr. $\gamma \nu \omega$-rós, L. gno-sco, Goth. kann (I know) ; Gr. $\theta a \nu$ beside $\theta \nu \eta$, そ̌- $\theta a v-o \nu$, $\theta$ áv-atos, $\theta \nu \eta$-rós, $\theta \nu \dot{\eta}$ - $\sigma \kappa \omega$, perhaps connected with Skr. dhmâ (to blow), and consequently $\theta a \nu$ would have meant originally "to blow," hence "to breathe," and then "to expire," \&c.
§. 91. According to the Indian Grammarians no Sanskrit verbal root ended in $\breve{a}$, and they write such roots either with $\bar{a}$, or with the addition of a suffix, such as $n, y(i), v(u)$; consequently we find in place of $d a$ (to give), s'a (to sharpen), $g a$ (to be born), hva (to call), \&c., the assumed forms dâ, s'ô (for sau), $g^{\prime} a n, k v e ̂$ (for hvai), \&c. The only roots that they write with $\check{a}$ are pronominal roots, such as $t a, s a$, \&c. We see, however, at once that this is merely an arbitrary custom, for we find numerous verbal roots in Sanscrit ending in $\breve{a}$ : khy $\breve{a}$ (to speak)
is the original root, and not khyâ, as we see from akhyăt; gă (to go) is found in gă-tas (nom. sing. part. praet. pass.), gă-hi (2 sing. imperat.), ga-k'k'hati (he goes), Gr. $\beta \varepsilon-\beta a-\mu \varepsilon \nu$; dă (to give), dadmas (we give) for dadamas, Gr. $\delta i-\delta o-\mu \varepsilon \nu$, L. dă-mus ; $d h a$ (to place), dadhmas (we place) for dadhamas, Gr. $\tau i-\theta \varepsilon-\mu \varepsilon \nu$, $\theta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}-\sigma \iota \varsigma, \theta_{\varepsilon}$ - $o ́ s=$ Ved. . dhi-tas $=$ Skr. hitas ; sthă (to stand), ti-shtha-ti (he stands), sthi-tas = Gr. $\sigma \tau$ - -тós, L. stă-tus ; $m a$ (to measure), mi-ti (measuring), mi-ta (measured), Gr. $\mu \varepsilon$ '$\tau \rho o v ; p \breve{a}$ (to drink), pibăti (he drinks), Gr. $\pi o^{\prime}-\sigma \iota s$; pă (to protect), pătis (a master) = Gr. $\pi o^{\prime}-\sigma \iota \varsigma, \delta \varepsilon \sigma-\pi o^{\prime}-\tau \eta \mathrm{s}$, Skr. pi-tar, Gr. $\pi \breve{a}-\tau \dot{\eta} \rho$; mă (to think), mati (mind), mătas (nom. sing. perf. pass. part.) $=\mu a \tau o s$ (in av̇oó- $\mu a \tau o s$ ), Gr. $\mu \varepsilon ́-\mu a-\mu \varepsilon \nu, \mu a-$ ío $\mu a \iota$ (I seek), $\mu a ́-\tau \eta \nu, \mu a ́-\tau a \iota o s$ (not real, only imagined, according to Benfey) ; ta (to stretch), tătas (nom. sing. pass. part.) = Gr.
 sing. perf. pass. part.) = Gr. фarós (in 'A@єí申atos, $\mu v \lambda \eta ́ \phi a-$ ros), $\pi \varepsilon-\phi \breve{a}-\mu a l$, \&c. These roots are written by the Sanskrit grammarians under the forms $k h y \hat{a}, g \hat{a}, d \hat{a}, d h \hat{a}, ~ s t h \hat{a}, m \hat{a}, p \hat{a}$, pâ, man, tan, han; but the grammatical forms above adduced prove that they also ended with $\breve{a}$ in Sanskrit. In Greek and Latin we frequently find roots ending with $\breve{a}$, which corresponds to Sanskrit roots ending with $\hat{a}$ or an; thus we find Gr. $\gamma^{\varepsilon}-\gamma \breve{a}-\mu \varepsilon \nu$ from R. $\gamma \boldsymbol{a}$ beside Skr. g'an (to produce, to grow); Gr. $\phi \breve{a}-\lambda$ ós (bright), $\phi a ́-\tau \iota s$ from R. $\phi a$ beside Skr. $b h \hat{a}$ (to shine); L. rătus from R. ra beside Skr. râ (to give), compare Ved. râtam astu with L. ratum esto and reor, \&c.
§. 92. Neither in Sanskrit nor in Greek do any roots occur of the form, aspirated mute + vowel + aspirated mute, except a few dialectic forms in the former language, and the forms* $\varepsilon^{\prime}-\theta a ́ \phi-\theta \eta \nu, \tau \varepsilon-\theta a ́ \phi-\theta a \iota, \tau \varepsilon-\theta a ́ \phi-\theta \omega, \tau \varepsilon-\theta a ́ \phi-a \tau a \iota, \tau \varepsilon-$
* Bopp (Vergleichende Grammatik., vol. i., p. 182, §. $104^{2}$ ) accounts for these forms (except $\tau \varepsilon \theta$ á $\phi a \tau a t$, which he confesses his inability to explain), partly from the inclination shown by the Greeks for the combination $\phi \theta$, and partly from the fact that $\phi$ in these cases was felt to belong to the root, and was therefore allowed to show itself again contrary to the usual custom.
$\theta_{\rho} a^{\phi}-\theta a l$, $\mathfrak{z}-\theta \rho^{\prime} \notin-\theta \eta \nu$, in the latter. In Indo-European, however, roots of this form were common, as is shown by the cognate languages; consult §. 31. But Sanskrit and Greek were opposed to such a combination, and always omitted the aspiration of one aspirated mute. This disinclination of Sanskrit and Greek to the proximity of two aspirates, is shown by the fact that when aspirates occur in two groups of consonants belonging to the same roots, and merely separated by a vowel, one of these aspirates, generally the first, loses its aspiration.* Thus in Sanskrit and Greek aspirates are reduplicated generally by the corresponding unaspirated consonants, but this law did not hold in Indo-European, as we see from the Latin fefelli, and the Oscan fufans, fefacust, \&c., in which, though $f$ be not a true aspirate, it represents an original Indo-European aspirate. Originally the whole root was repeated in reduplicated syllables, as we see in Sanskrit intensive forms, $\dagger$ such as $d a r i d r a \hat{\ddagger} \ddagger$ (to be poor) from $d r \hat{a}$ (to run)
 from dars' (to see) $=$ Gr. $\delta € \varrho \kappa, k^{\prime} \mathrm{r}^{2} k a r$, or k'arikar, or k'arkar, from kar (to make), \&c., and in such Greek forms as $\pi a \mu$ $\phi a i v \omega$ for $\phi a \nu-\phi a \nu-y \omega, \mu \hat{\xi} \rho-\mu \eta \rho-a$ (care) and $\mu \hat{\epsilon} \rho-\mu \varepsilon \rho-o s$ (careladen) from R. $\mu \varepsilon \rho=$ Skr. smar (to remember), $\mu a \rho-\mu a i \rho-\omega$ (I shine) from R. $\mu a \rho$ whence $\mu \dot{\alpha} \rho-\mu a \rho-o s$ (stone, marble, lit. ".what glistens") ; K $\hat{\rho} \rho-\mathrm{kv} \rho-\alpha$ (lit. Round town) from same root as кịo-k-os (a ring), кí-k $\lambda$-os, L. circus, \&c.

[^66]Although in Greek we generally find no combinations such as aspirated mute + vowel + aspirated mute, we frequently find such as spiritus asper + vowel + aspirated mute or $\dot{\rho}+$ vowel + aspirated mute ; thus we find $\dot{a} \phi-\dot{\eta}$ (a fasten-
 vabh whence Skr. ûrna-vâ-bhas (nom. sing. a spider, lit. a weaver of wool) ; $\dot{\eta} \theta-\mu \tilde{c}^{\prime} s^{*}$ (a strainer) from ${ }_{\eta} \theta \omega=\sigma \hat{\eta} \theta \omega$ (I sift);
 haps compensating for $\pi$ (as in in iт $\tau \mu a \iota=\pi \iota \pi \tau a \mu a \iota$ from I. E. pat), if the root be $\pi \varepsilon \pi$, whence $\pi \varepsilon \pi-$-ós, $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi-\omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$, \&c.; $\mathfrak{v} \theta$ - $\lambda$ os (idle talk), from R. $\dot{v} \delta$, whence $\tilde{v} \delta \omega \rho$, or from same root as Skr. vad (to speak); $\dot{\rho} \circ \phi-\hat{\epsilon} \omega$ (I swallow), $\dot{\rho} \circ \phi-\dot{a} \nu \omega$ (id.) beside L. sorbeo, Lith. srebiù (I swallow); $\dot{\rho} \not \subset-\bar{\eta}(a$ throwing) beside $\rho i \pi-\tau \omega, \& \mathrm{E}$. In these cases the spiritus asper either is inorganic, and did not exist in Indo-European, or represents a lost consonant, generally $s$, and the same may be said of the aspiration of $\rho$; in no case does either aspiration seem to represent an original aspirated mute.
§. 93. In Sanskrit we find several combinations of more than one syllable classified as roots, but such forms are not true roots. They arise either from the reduplication of true roots, as $g^{\prime}$ agar (to wake) from I. E. gar whence Gr. $\left.\begin{array}{l}\gamma \varepsilon \xi \rho \omega \dagger \\ \dagger \\ \text { for } \\ \gamma \varepsilon \gamma \varepsilon \rho \omega\end{array}\right)$ $k^{\prime}$ a-kâs (to shine) from kâ̂s (id.), \&c. ; or from the union of prepositions with true roots, as avadhir (to despise) from ava (de, ab) and dlîr, which Bopp connects with dhî (the mind), san̈grâm (to fight) from sam (Gr. óvy, L. cum) and kram (to go), unless it be a denominative formed from sangrâma (a fight), \&c. ; or from nouns, as kumâr (to play) from kumâra (a boy), \&c.
§. 94. Roots in general may be divided into the two great

* This word is generally written $\dot{\eta} \theta \mu \rho_{\rho}$, the spiritus asper becoming the lenis on account of the following $\theta$ as in " $\chi \chi^{\omega}$. On Sigeian Inscription it is written $\dot{\eta} \theta \mu o \delta_{s}$.
$\dagger$ Some consider initial $\varepsilon$ here to be merely prosthetic, while Pott derives it from $\boldsymbol{k}$. The view taken above is, however, much more plausible.
classes, verbal (called also qualitative or predicative), and pronominal (called also demonstrative). The first class is composed of verbs and nouns, of which the former stand in a closer connexion with the root than the latter. Originally there was no difference between verb and noun, the root $d a$, for example, signifying the giver, the thing given, the act of giving, \&c. The second class consists of all the pronouns, most prepositions, conjunctions, and particles, which are generally derived from pronominal roots, and perhaps a few other words. In this class the root and the stem are identical, and the roots express some relation to the speaker, while those of the first class express a state or action.
§. 95. The chief pronominal roots in Indo-European were* $k v a$ (who) whence Skr. $k u-t a s$ (whence), $k a-s$ (who), $k a-d$
 $\kappa \bar{\omega} \varsigma, \tau^{\prime}, \kappa \alpha-\stackrel{\iota}{\prime}$ (an old locative), кย́v ( $\kappa \dot{\varepsilon}$, Dor. кáv) $=$ Skr. kam, L. quis, quae, ,quid, \&c. ; ga or gha (perhaps derived from kva or $k a$ ), whence Skr. $h a=$ Ved. gha or ghâ (indeed), Gr. ovं- $\chi^{i}, \gamma^{\prime}$; $y a$ (who) whence Skr. $y a-s, y \hat{a}, y a-d=\mathrm{Gr}$. o̊s, ${ }_{\eta} \boldsymbol{\eta}, ~ o ̊, ~ L . ~ j a m$; $i$ (he, she, it) when Skr. $i$-yam, id-am, $i$-ha (here) for $i d h a$, Gr. ${ }^{\prime},-i$ (in oviтoбi, \&c.), L. is, ea, id, i-terum, $i$-pse, \&c.; ta (this) Skr. tam, tâm, tad= Gr. тóv, тńv, тó, Gr. oủ-тos, av̉-тós, L. $i s-t e, i s-t a$, is-tud, tum, tam, ipse (for $i-p-t e$ ), $i$-ta, $i$-tem, \&c.; da (perhaps derived from $t a$ ), Skr. $k a-d \hat{a}$ (when), Gr. $\pi 0-\delta \alpha-\pi o ́ s$,
 $i n-d e, u n-d e$, qui-dem, \&c.; dha (closely connected with $d a$ ), Skr. a-dhas (below), adhara-s (= L. inferu-s), i-ha (here) for
 and $i$-bi, according to Leo Meyer for $c u-d h i$ and $i-d h i$; sa (he), Skr. $s a, s \hat{a}=$ Gr. $\dot{\delta}, \dot{\eta}$, Skr. $s a-k r t($ once), Gr. $\ddot{a}-\pi a \xi, \dot{a}-\pi \lambda o u ̃ \varsigma$, O. L. sum, sam, sos, sas (acc. sing. and pl., masc. and fem.), \&c.; na, an, ana, Skr. nas (us), na (not, lest; like, Vedic), ana-yā (instr. sing., through her), an-tara-s (alius), an-ya-s (alius), Gr. $\nu \dot{\omega}, \nu i ́ v, \nu \dot{\eta}, \nu \tilde{v} \nu, \nu a i ́, a ̉ v, ~ \grave{\varepsilon} \nu, a ̉ \nu a ́, ~ L . ~ n o s, ~ n e, ~ n u m, ~$

[^67]nam,* in, ㅅ.c.; pa, Skr. a-pa (away), pa-r̂̂ (away), Gr. à- $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ó, $\pi \varepsilon-\rho \prime ́, \pi a-\rho a ́, \pi-\rho o ́, \mathrm{~L} . a b, p-r o, p e-r, \dagger \& c . ; b h a$ (which is, perhaps, connected with $p a$; there does not appear to be any trace of a stem $b a$ ), Skr. -bhis (term of instr. pl.), -bhyas (term. of dat. and abl. pl.), -bhyâm (term. of instr., dat. and abl. dual), Gr. ${ }^{\prime} a-\phi \omega=$ Skr. $u$-bha (both) = L. $a m b o, \beta$ í $\eta-\phi \iota, \nu a \tilde{v}-$ $\phi i v$, L. ti-bi, mi-hi, no-bis, \&c.; va, $\ddagger$ Skr. va-yam (we), which Bopp considers to be a weakened form of ma-yam, but E. we, Goth. veis, G. wir, establish the originality of the initial $v$, Skr. vas (ye, acc. pl.) and vâm (ye two, acc. dual), Gr. aṽ, aù-тós, ov̉̀ (?), aù-тáp, L. ne-ve, vos, tu = t-va (Skr. tvam, thou), \&c.; ma, Skr. mâm and mâ (me, acc. sing.), ma-y $\hat{a}$ (instr. sing.), Gr. $\mu^{\varepsilon}, \mu_{a ́}, \mu^{\prime}\left(=\right.$ Skr. $m \hat{a}$, not), $\mu^{\prime} \nu$, L. $m e$, ego-me-t, \&c.
§. 96. No verbal root can by itself form a word. It becomes a word by the addition of a pronominal root; thus from the Latin verbal roots reg (to rule), luc (to shine), we form the words rex (reg-s) and lux (luc $+s$ ) by the addition of the pronominal root sa.
§. 97 . Verbal and pronominal roots frequently agree in form : thus $i$ is a verbal root meaning 'to go,' and a pronominal root meaning ' $h e$ '; similarly $t a$ (to stretch) and ta (this), ka (to be sharp) and $k a$ (who), unless $k v a$ be the original form of this pronominal root, as is probable. In consequence of this agreement, some writers have derived the pronominal from the verbal roots: thus Schleicher (Compendium, §. 265, p. 642, 2nd Ed.), writes: "I take $m a$ (I) to be identical with the verbal root ma (to measure, think); this root also signifies 'homo' (compare Skr. ma-nu-, Goth. ma-n-), who was described as

* Nam is derived by some writers from I. E. nâman (a name).
† L. per, pro, Gr. $\pi a \rho \dot{\alpha}$, \&e., may, however, be all connected with I. E. root par (to penetrate, cross, \&c.).
$\ddagger V a$ originally meant "is, ea, id." We have Old Persian ava (iste) from same root. Initial $t$ was probably lost before Skr. vas and vâm; compare Skr. tvam (thou) $=t+v a+m$ for $t a+v a+m$.
' the thinker ;' what could ' $l$ ' have been originally save 'man'? 'The abstract conception of the ' $I$ ' cannot certainly be attributed to the oldest stage of the Indo-European (ursprache)." Bopp adduces as an argument against the deduction of pronominal roots from verbal, his supposition, that no verbal root ends in $\breve{a}$, whilst pronominal roots for the most part end in this vowel. We have, however, already seen that many verbal roots do actually end in $\breve{a}$, so that this argument of Bopp is valueless. The Indian grammarians derive all words, without exception, from verbal roots, either existing or invented by them for this purpose ; thus, ta (this, he) they derive from $\tan$ (to stretch), $y a$ (who) from $y_{a g}$ (to worship, yadi (when) from yat (to make an effort), \&c. Such derivations are of course preposterous; but these grammarians are not the only persons who offend in this way.

The connexion between verbal and pronominal roots is is still unknown, and likely to remain so, for we have no materials on which to base our reasonings. A few sentences of Indo-European, as it was spoken when the Indo-Europeans first began to exist as a distinct race, would probably clear up the difficulty.

Even if verbal and pronominal roots were originally identical, they must have been distinguished from each other in very early times, in fact, before the origin of any grammatical forms whatsoever, for these forms presuppose the distinction. "First," writes Curtius (zur Chronologie der Indogermanischen Sprachforschung, p. 205), "through this duality light and shade come into language, first through this it becomes possible to arrange words beside each other so as to express a meaning, the necessary condition of all further development."
§. 98. Verbal roots are twofold, primary and secondary. The primary consists (1) of a single short vowel, as $\check{\imath}$ (to go) ; or (2) of a consonant + a short vowel, as $d \breve{a}$ (to give), $d h \breve{a}$ (to place), $p \breve{a}$ (to drink), $k \tau$ (to lie); or (3) of a short vowel +a
consonant, as $\breve{d} d$ (to eat), $\check{k} k$ (to be sharp), $\breve{a} s$ (to be), $\check{v d h}$ (to burn) ; or (4) of a consonant + a short vowel + a consonant, as $d \check{a} r$ (to tear), bhăr (to bear), d $d \tau v$ (to shine), păt (to fall, fly); or (5) of two consonants + a short vowel, as stă (to stand).

The last division (5) of these roots is very small, and perhaps belongs to the secondary class.

Secondary roots are formed from primary by the addition of a new sound, or sounds, called by Curtius the root determinative. The object of this addition is to express a modification of the meaning of the primary root. Thus from I. E. $y u$ (to bind, to mix dough, \&c.), came I. E. yug (to unite intentionally, to yoke horses), and I. E. yudh (to unite for the purpose of fighting) ; from I. E. gan (to produce), came gnâ (for ganâ or gna $+a$ ) to express the idea of "knowing how to produce;" similarly from I. E. man (to think), came mn $\hat{a}$ (to remember) ; \&c.
§. 99. A complete list of the primary and secondary roots of Indo-European does not fall within the scope of the present work. It will be sufficient here to give a few examples of the chief root-determinatives.
$K$ (root-determinative). Primary root, I. E. tar or tra (to move), whence Skr. tarala (tremulous), tara (a passage), -tara (term. of comparative) $=$ Gr. $-\tau \varepsilon \rho 0=\mathrm{L}$. -ter (in dex-ter), -tra (in con-tra), ter-minus ; secondary root, Skr. tark (to suppose, lit., to turn in one's mind), tarku (a spindle), Gr. $\dot{\alpha}-\tau \rho \varepsilon \kappa-\eta$ ' $s$, ä-т@ак-тоs (a spindle), L. torqu-eo, torc-ular, torqu-es. Pr. root, I. E. pat whence Skr. pat (to fall, fly), pat-ra (a wing), Gr. кага- $\pi \tau \eta-\tau \eta \nu, \pi i \pi \tau \omega$ for $\pi \iota-\pi \varepsilon \tau-\omega, \pi \varepsilon \tau-о \mu a \iota, \pi \tau \varepsilon-\rho o ́ \nu, \pi \tau \bar{\omega}-$ $\sigma \iota$, L. pet-o, penna $=$ O. L. pesna for pet-na; sec. root, Gr. $\pi \tau a ̆ \kappa, ~ \xi '-\pi \tau \alpha \kappa-0 \nu, \pi \tau \eta j \sigma \sigma \omega$ for $\pi \tau \eta \kappa-y \omega, \pi \tau \dot{\prime} \xi, \pi \tau \dot{\prime} \sigma \sigma \omega$ for $\pi \tau \omega \kappa-$ $-y \omega$. Pr. roet, I. E. $g v a$ (to go), whence Skr. $g \hat{a}$ or $g a$ (to go), Gr. $\beta a$; sec. root $\beta$ кк, Gr. $\beta$ áк-т $\rho о \nu$, L. bac-ilum. Pr. root, Gr. ò $\lambda$ (to destroy), ö $\lambda-\lambda \nu \mu \iota$ for $\grave{o} \lambda-\nu v-\mu \iota$; sec. root, $\grave{\partial} \lambda_{\varepsilon \kappa, ~}^{\text {, }}$ ò $\lambda$ ह́к-оуто. Pr. root, I. E. var (? to draw) whence Skr. var (to choose), L. vel-lo for vel-yo ; sec. root, Gr. F६ $\lambda_{\kappa}$, $\varepsilon i \lambda_{\kappa} \boldsymbol{\nu} v=$
${ }_{E F E} \lambda_{k o v}$. In English we similarly find roots lengthened by $k$, as hark, talk, pluck, beside hear, tell, pull.
$G$ (root-det.). Pr. root, yu (to bind; sec. root, Skr. yug-a (a yoke, pair), Gr. $\zeta_{\nu \dot{\gamma}-o ́ v, ~ L . ~ j u g-u m . ~}^{\text {. }}$

Kh for $s k$ (root-det.) $=$ Skr. $k^{\prime} h=$ Gr. $\chi$. Pr. root, gva (to go) $=$ Skr. ga; sec. root, Skr. gak'h-ati (he goes) $=$ Gr. $\beta$ á $\sigma$ - $\varepsilon$ -
 probably. $\Sigma \kappa$ here is perhaps the remains of a root $=\mathbf{I}$. E. sak to (follow) whence L. sequ-or, \&c.
$T$ (root-det.). Pr. root, Skr. $d y u=d i v$ (to shine); sec. root, Skr. dyut (id.). Pr. root, I. E. av (to blow), whence
 $\dot{a} \tau-\mu o^{\prime}$, àє $\tau-\mu о \nu$ ( $\pi \nu \varepsilon \bar{\nu} \mu a$, Hesych). From the sec. root, Skr. tup (to strike) $=\mathrm{Gr} . \tau v \pi$ comes another sec. root, Gr. $\tau \dot{\tau} \pi-\tau-\omega$. Similarly from Gr. $\theta a \pi$ or $\tau a \phi$, comes a sec. root, $\theta$ án- $\tau-\omega$.* It is doubtfnl whether $\tau a \phi$ or $\theta a \pi$ be a primary or a secondary root; if it be $=$ Skr. tap (to burn) beside Gr. $\tau^{\prime} \phi-\rho a$, L. tep-eo, A. S. thef-ian (aestuare), it is a primary root and originally meant "to burn" (sc. the dead). On the other hand, if it be formed from dha (to place) = Skr. dhâ, by the root-determinative $p$, it is a secondary root, $\theta a \pi$ ( $\tau a \phi$ ) : dhap : : $\theta u \pi$ ( $\tau v \phi)$ : Skr. dhîp (to fumigate).
$D$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I. E. ska (to cleave) whence Gr.
 scindo), L. de-sci-sco, sci-o ; sec. root, Skr. skhad (to cut), Gr. $\sigma \kappa \delta \delta-a \nu v v \mu \iota$, L. scindo. Pr. root, I. E. ma (to measure), whence
 ius, mod-eror, mod-us. Pr. root, I. E. ru (to sound) : sec. root, Skr. rud (to weep), L. rud-o.
$D h$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I. E. yu (to join); sec. root, Skr. yudh (to fight, manus conserere), Z. yud (to fight), Gr. $\dot{v} \sigma-\mu i \nu \eta$ for $\dot{v} \theta-\mu \nu \nu \eta$. Pr. root, I. E. pa (to suffer); sec. root, Gr. $\frac{\ell}{\varepsilon}-\pi a \theta-o v$, L. patior being formed from same root by means of a different suffix $(t)$, unless Gr. $\theta$ and L. $t$ represent an I. E.

[^68]th, as is supposed by those who believe in the existence of the hard aspirates in Indo-European. Pr. root, I. E. dar (to sleep) whence Skr. $d r \hat{a}$ (id.), L. dor-mi-o; sec. root, Gr. غ́- $\delta \rho a 0-o \nu, \delta a \rho \theta-a ́ \nu \omega$. Pr. root, I. E. $p u$ (to stink), whence Skr. pûy (id.), Z. pû (id.), Gr. $\pi v ́-o v, ~ L . ~ p u s, ~ p u-t-e o, ~ G o t h . ~$ $f u-l s$ (foul); sec. root, Gr. $\pi \dot{v} \theta-\omega$. This root-determinative is of frequent occurrence in Greek ;* thus we have such forms as $\nu \dot{\eta}-\theta-\omega$ from R. $\nu \varepsilon(\nu \varepsilon \in-\omega)$, $\sigma \dot{\eta}-\theta-\omega$ from R. $\sigma \alpha\left(\sigma \alpha^{\prime}-\omega\right), \phi \lambda \varepsilon \gamma-$ $\varepsilon-\theta-\omega, \pi \rho \eta \dot{\eta}-\theta-\omega$ from R. $\pi \rho a=$ I. E. par, whence Ch. Sl. pal-iti
 ${ }^{\prime} \chi \chi-\theta$-opaı beside ${ }^{\prime} \not \subset \chi$-os, \&c. $\Theta$ is frequently added to secondary roots in $\nu$ : thus from $\pi \varepsilon \nu=\pi a+\nu$ we have $\pi \varepsilon \in-\pi o \nu \theta-\alpha$ and $\pi \varepsilon v \theta$-os ; from I. E. man (to think) $=m a$ (to measure) + $n$, whence Gr. $\mu \tilde{\eta} \nu \bullet \iota \varsigma, \mu \varepsilon ́ \nu-o s$, L. mens, \&c., we have Gr. $\mu a \nu \theta$ $\alpha^{\prime} \nu \omega, \mu \varepsilon \nu \theta-\eta \tilde{\eta} \rho a \iota(\phi \varrho о \nu \tau i \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$, Hesych.). B $\quad \imath \theta-$ os which is related to $\beta a^{\prime} \theta-\mathrm{os}$ as $\pi \varepsilon v \theta-\mathrm{os}$ is to $\pi \dot{\alpha} \theta-\mathrm{os}$, is derived from R. $\beta \varepsilon \nu=$ $\beta a+\nu$ from $\beta a$ (to go), unless indeed in both these cases ( $\pi \varepsilon \nu \theta$-os and $\beta^{\prime} \nu \theta-o s$ ), the forms $\pi a \theta$ and $\beta a \theta$ are the older, and $\pi \varepsilon \nu \theta$ and $\beta_{\varepsilon \nu} \theta$ formed from them by the insertion of $\nu$. $\mathrm{Ba}^{\prime} \theta-\mathrm{os}, \beta a \theta-$ v́s $_{s}, \beta v \theta$-ós perhaps come from a root $\beta a \theta$ (to dive into) $=$ Skr. $g a \hat{h} h(\mathrm{id})=.\mathrm{I} . \mathrm{E} . g v a+d h$ from $g v a$ (to go).
$S$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I. E. ark or rak (to preserve), whence Gr. ä $\lambda_{\kappa-\eta}$, á $\rho \kappa-\varepsilon \in \omega$, L. arc-eo, arc- $a$; sec. root, Skr. raksh $($ to defend $)=r a k+s$, Gr. $\dot{a}-\lambda \dot{\varepsilon} \xi-\omega$. Pr. root, I. E. tar or tra (to move); sec. root, Skr. tras (to tremble), Z. tares'
 for $\tau \rho \varepsilon \sigma$ - $\rho \circ \rho$, L. terr-eo for ters-eo, tris-tis (?). Pr. root, I. E. dak (to bite), whence Skr. dañs' (id.), Gr. סáк- $\nu \omega$, סáк-os (a bite, beast), Goth. tah-ja (I tear); sec. root, Gr. ó- $\delta a^{\prime} \xi-\omega$. Pr. root, I. E. vag (to increase), whence Skr. ug-ra (strong), ôg'-as (power), Z. vaz (to strengthen), Gr. í $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{-\iota-\eta}{ }^{\prime}$, L. veg-eo, vig-eo, aug-eo, Goth. auka (I increase) ; sec. root, Skr. vaksh (to grow),


[^69]Pr. root, I. E. dak (to take), whence Ion. סéк-оцаı, סáк-тv入os; sec. root, Skr. daksh-a (clever), daksh-ina (right), Gr. $\delta=\hat{\xi} \xi-$-ıos, L. dex-ter, Goth. taihs-vō ( $\delta_{\varepsilon} \xi_{\iota}{ }^{\prime}$ ).
$N$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I. E. gva (to go), whence Skr. $g \hat{a}$ (id.), Z. $g \hat{a}$ (id.), Gr. $\xi_{-}-\beta \eta-\nu,(\beta a-\tau o ́ s, ~ L . ~ a r-b i-t e r ; ~ s e c . ~ r o o t, ~$ $\beta a i \nu \omega=\beta a \nu-y \omega$, O. ben-ust ( $=$ L. ven-erit). Pr. root, I. E. $g a$ (to be born, to produce), whence Gr. $\gamma \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}-\gamma a-a$; sec. root, Skr. g'an (to bring forth), Gr. $\gamma^{\varepsilon} v$-oc, L. gen-us. Pr. root, I. E. bha (to shine), whence Skr. $b h \hat{a}$ (id.), Gr. $\phi a ́-\tau \iota \varsigma ̧, ~ L . ~ f a-~$ teor ; sec. root, $\phi$ aì $\omega=\phi a \nu-y \omega$. Pr. root, I. E. ta (to stretch), whence Gr. $\tau \dot{\alpha} \cdot \nu v-\tau \alpha \iota=$ Skr. ta-nu-tê ; sec. root, Gr. $\tau \varepsilon i v \omega=$ $\tau \varepsilon \nu-y \omega$.
$R$ or $L$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I. E. $m a$ (to measure), whence Skr. mâ (id.), Gr. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon}-$-т $\rho o \nu$; sec. root, Gr. $\mu \notin \rho-o \varsigma$, $\mu о і ̈ \rho-a, \mu \varepsilon \imath \rho-о \mu a \iota=\mu \varepsilon \rho-y о \mu a \iota$, L. mĕr-ео, mer-ces, mer-x. Pr. root, I. E. sta (to stand) ; sec. root, Skr. sthal (to stand firmly), sthal- $\alpha$ (firm ground), Gr. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \hat{\ell} \lambda \omega=\sigma \tau \varepsilon \lambda-y \omega$, L. prae-stol-or, stul-tus, stol-idus, O. H. G. stel-lan (to place). Pr. root, I. E. sta (to stand) ; sec. root, Skr. sthir-a (fast), star-î (vacca sterilis), Gr. $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho \cdot \rho \circ o ́ s, ~ \sigma \tau \varepsilon i ̃ \rho a=\sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho-y a$, Goth. stairo ( $\sigma \tau \varepsilon i ̣ a)$ ), M. H. G. star (rigidus).
$P$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I. E. tar or tra (to move); sec. root, Skr. (Ved.) trp-ra (hastening), trap (to be embarrassed),
 (according to Benfey). This I. E. root tra was weakened to tru, whence Gr. $\tau \boldsymbol{\rho} \tilde{v}^{-} \chi \omega$ (I rub away), т $\boldsymbol{\imath} \boldsymbol{i}-\sigma \kappa \omega$ (id. Hesych.), $\tau \rho v ́-\omega$ (id.), $\tau \rho \tilde{v}-\mu \mu$ (a hole) ; sec. root, Gr. $\tau \rho \dot{\pi} \pi-a \nu o v, \tau \rho v \pi-$ ${ }^{\boldsymbol{a}} \omega$. Pr. root, I. E. $d h u$ (to move), whence Skr. $d h \hat{u}$ (to move, to blow), dĥ̂-ma-s (smoke) = Gr. $\theta v-\mu o ́-s=\mathrm{L} . f u-m u-s, Z$. dun-man (mist), Gr. $\theta \dot{v}-\varepsilon \lambda \lambda a, \theta \dot{v}-\mathrm{o}$, L. sub-fi-o, O. H. G. tunst (storm), O. N. dust (dust), Lith. du-mas (mind); sec. root, Skr. dhûp (to fumigate), Gr. $\tau v \phi-\omega \dot{v}$ (a whirlwind), rú $\phi-\omega$ (I

[^70]smoke), $\tau \tilde{u} \phi$-os (mist). Pr. root, I. E. $d a$ (to cut), whence Skr. $d \hat{a}$ (id.), Gr. $\delta a-i ́ \omega, \delta a-i ́ \varsigma, \delta a-\sigma \mu o ́ \varsigma, \delta a t-\tau v-\mu \omega ́ \nu$; sec. root, Gr. $\delta a ́ \pi-\tau \omega, \delta a \pi-a ́ \nu \eta, \delta \varepsilon i \pi-\nu o v$.
$B$ (root-det.). Pr. root tri weakened from I E. tra (to move) ; sec. root, Gr. $\tau \rho i \beta-\omega$, L. trib-ula.
$B h$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I.E. sta (to stand) ; sec. root, Skr. stambh (to make firm), Gr. $\dot{\alpha}-\sigma \tau \varepsilon \mu \phi-\eta ́ s$ (unshaken), $\sigma \tau \varepsilon ́ \mu \beta-\omega$ (I shake by stamping), A. S. stemn (stem) $=s t a b h+n a$. Pr. root, I. E. va (to twine round), whence Skr. va-yâmi (I weave), Gr. $\eta$ - $\tau \rho \circ \boldsymbol{\nu}$ (the warp), L vimen; sec. root, Skr. ûrna-vâbh-a (a spider, lit. a spinner of wool, Gr. $\dot{v} \phi-\bar{\eta}$, ú $\phi-$ aìv, $\dot{v} \phi-\eta \eta^{\prime} \phi-\alpha \sigma \mu a \iota$.
$V$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I. E. sta (to stand); sec. root, Skr. sthâv-ara (fixed), Z. s'tavra (strong), Gr. $\sigma \tau a v-\rho o ́ s, ~ \sigma \tau \varepsilon \tilde{v}-$ то, Goth. stiviti ( $\dot{\boldsymbol{\pi}} \boldsymbol{0} \boldsymbol{\mu} \boldsymbol{\nu} \eta \dot{\eta})$. Pr. root, I. E. bha (to shine); sec. root, Gr. $\phi a ́-o s ~ f o r ~ \phi a F-o s, ~ Æ o l . ~ \phi a v ̃-o s, ~ \pi \imath-\phi a v ́-\sigma \kappa \omega, ~$ Pamph. фá $\beta-o s(=\phi a \mathrm{~F}-o s)$, L. fav-eo, fav-illa, fau-stus.
$M$ (root-det.). Pr. root, I. E. tra (to move); sec. root, Gr. т@́́ $\mu-\omega$, L. trem-0, trem-ulus. Pr. root, I. E. gva (to go); sec. root, Skr. gam (to go), Z. gam (id.), Goth. quim-an (to come). Pr. root, I. E. da (to bind), whence Skr. (Ved.) dâ (id.), Gr. $\delta i-\delta \eta-\mu \iota, \delta \varepsilon$-тós, $\delta \varepsilon ́-\omega$; sec. root, Skr. dam (to tame), Gr. $\delta a \mu-\alpha, \omega, \delta \mu \omega^{\prime}-\varsigma^{\prime}, \delta \alpha ́ \mu-\alpha \rho$, L. dom-o, E. tame.
§. 98. The primary roots were chronologically older than the secondary. Some writers support the opposite, and believe that the so-called primary forms were obtained by generalization from the so-called secondary. They suppose that they were originally special terms, for different cognate ideas, e. g. for yoking horses (yug), coming together for the purpose of fighting (yudh), \&c., and that from these roots was developed the general idea of uniting for any purpose ( $y u$ ). This opinion is extremely unlikely; it is far more probable that the simplest form of the root was the oldest, as expressing the fundamental idea of all the secondary roots.

The oldest form of an I. E. root was perhaps either (1) ă

+ any consonant ; or (2) any consonant $+\breve{a}$. Thus the most primitive roots were $k \breve{a}, \breve{a} k, d \breve{a}, \breve{a} d, \& c$. The origin of such roots is wrapped in impenetrable obscurity, for we have no remains of any I. E. language in its radical stage to supply us with materials on which we might found our investigations. We may theorize as much as we like, but that is all that we can do. It is puerile to dogmatize.*
§. 99. The origin of the root-determinatives is as obscure as that of the primary roots themselves. Various theories have indeed been invented to account for them; but although a few of them may be explained by these theories, the vast majority of them are still as dark as ever. Thus it has been suggested that secondary roots arise from nominal stems, e. g. I. E. gan (to produce), from a nom. stem gana derived from R. $g a+$ nom. suffix $n a$; but in the first place, on this theory, primitive verbs would be confounded with denominative, and in the second, very few of the usual root-determinatives ever appear as nominal suffixes, e. g. $p$ is a common root-det., but never occurs as a nominal suffix. Again we are told that secondary roots are compounded of two primary verbal ones; thus I. E. yudh (to fight), is derived from $y u$ (to join), and dha (to place), and consequently meant originally "to make to join," I. E. kalp (to make), is from kar (to make) + pa (to do), \&c. Thirdly, secondary roots are said to consist of a primary verbal root + a pronominal root; e. g. the root determinatives, $k, t, m$, are identified with the pronominal roots $k a, t a, m a$ : this is, however, the merest guess-work, and sheds no light at all on the subject.

We must, therefore, for the present be content to be ignorant of the origin of these secondary roots, but we need not

* Here is a specimen of dogmatism with respect to one theory of the origin of roots. "The onomatopoeic theory goes very smoothly as long as it deals with cackling hens and quacking ducks; but round that poultry yard there is a dead wall, and we soon find that it is behind that wall that language really begins."-Max Müller, Lectures II. p. 91.
give up all hope of being ever able to account for them, for it is quite possible that at some future period, when the non-Indo-European languages shall have been thoroughly studied and their connexion with the Indo-European family discovered, these root-determinatives may be easily explained.


## §. 100. Stems.

The stem of a noun or verb is that portion of the word that remains after the case-endings or personal endings have been removed. The first class of stems is called nominal, and the second verbal. Thus the nominal stems of Skr. dêvas (nom. sing. a god), as'vasya (gen. sing. a horse), Gr. $i ँ \pi \pi o s, ~ i ̋ \pi \pi o v, \mathrm{~L}$. divus, equus, \&c., are Skr. dêva, as'va, Gr. $i \pi \pi \pi$, L. divo, equo, \&c. The verbal stems of Skr. imas (we go) $=$ Gr. $\imath^{\prime} \mu \varepsilon \nu$, Skr. bharati (he bears) = Gr. фє $\rho \varepsilon \iota, ~ L . ~ i ̄ m u s$, are Skr. $\iota,=$ Gr. $\iota$, Skr. bhara $=$ Gr. $\phi \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon$, and L. $\bar{\imath}$.

Stems may be of three kinds: (1) they may consist of the root alone, its vowel being sometimes affected by guna or vrddhi ; (2) of the root + a pronominal suffix, the vowel of the root being affected as in (1) ; (3) of the union of two stems so as to form a single new one.
I. Stems formed from the root alone* are such as Skr. $\hat{e}$ in $\hat{e} m i$ (I go), $i$ in imas (we go), from R. $i$, the guna of which is $\hat{e}$, Gr. òm in ö $\psi$ from R. óm, \&c. We find many examples of nominal stems consisting of the mere root, such as Gr. $\dot{j} \pi$, the vowel of the root being sometimes lengthened as in Skr. vâk' (the voice), from R. vak' (to speak). Thus in Skr. we have yudh (a fight), kshudh (hunger), mud(joy), bhî (fear), drs' (the eye), vis' (a man), \&c., from the verbal roots yudh, kshudh, \&c. In Greek we have $\phi \lambda o \gamma$ ( $\phi \lambda o ́ \xi$ ) from R. $\phi \lambda \varepsilon \gamma, \& c$. In Latin we have ped $(p \bar{e} s=p e ̆ d s)$ from I. E. pad (to go), vōc $(v \bar{o} x)=$ Skr.

* Consult Schleicher Compendium, pp. 346 seq., 374 seq., and Curtius zur Chronologie, \&c., pp. 218 seq.
vâk', \&c. Curtius supposes that the signification of such stems as these was originally a mean between an infinitive and a participle, and nearly the same as that of English forms in -ing; e. g. vis' (a man) from vis' (to enter), originally meant "the entering" person; $d r s^{\prime}$ (the eye) from $d r s^{\prime}$ (to see) meant "the seeing" faculty; \&c.

In stems of this first class the root was sometimes reduplicated, as in Skr. dadâmi= Gr. $\delta i \delta \omega \mu$, \&c.
II. Stems formed from the root + a pronominal suffix, are such as Skr. dêva (a god) from dêv, the guna-form of R. div (to shine), and pronominal suffix $a$; Skr. divya (celestial) from $d i v+y a$; Skr. bhâra (a burden) =Gr. фo oo from Skr. bhâr the guna-form of bhar (to bear) = Gr. $\phi \varepsilon \rho$ and pron. suffix $a$; Skr. bhâraya, the stem of bhârayati (he makes to bear) from $b h a ̂ r+a+y a$, and similar causative forms; \&c.

Before nominal stems were formed from roots by means of pronominal suffixes, the root itself must have been used independently as a nominal stem, for the pronominal suffix has merely an individualizing force, and is nearly equivalent to an article. In the earliest stage of Indo-European, language consisted of roots placed in juxtaposition ; at this period there were no stems, no case-endings, no personal endings, no distinction between noun and verb. The root bhar, for example, signified "to bear," "bearing," "the burden," "the bearer," \&c. The next stage through which Indo-European passed was the formation of verbal stems. Nouns were now distinguished from verbs only negatively, that is, only by the absence of the pronominal suffixes. This stage again was followed by another, in which nominal stems were formed by the addition of these suffixes in order to individualize the root that had been used as a noun. That the verbal suffixes are older than the nominal ones is shown by the fact, that the latter are preserved in a much more perfect form in the IndoEuropean languages than the former ; thus we find the suffixes $a$, an, ma, ta, \&c., still kept perfect in nominal stems,
while no single personal ending is found in its original form.* An additional proof that verbal and nominal stems were formed at different periods is supplied by the consideration that, as the same suffixes are in many cases used to form both classes of stems, a considerable period must have elapsed between the use of the same suffix in two such totally different ways. Moreover, as the original meaning of the pronounis more manifest in the verbal stem than in the nominal, the former must have been older than the latter ; thus the pronominal stem ta (he, she, it) is employed to form the 3 pers. sing. of the verb, as bharati (he bears), and also such nouns as Skr. sthi-ta-s (standing) $=$ Gr. $\sigma \tau \alpha-\tau o ́-\varsigma, ~ G r . ~ ф о ́ \rho-\tau о-\varsigma, ~ к о і ́-т \eta, ~ L . ~ s e c-~$ $t a, d o c-t u-s, \& c$. , and it is obvious that its original meaning can be much more easily discovered from the verb than from the noun.

Pronominal suffixes are twofold, primary and secondary. The former are employed in forming stems from roots, and the latter in forming stems from other stems. Stems formed directly from roots are called primary, and those from stems, secondary. In many cases these suffixes agree in form : thus $a$ is a primary suffix in Skr. bhâr-a-s (a burden) = Gr. фó $\rho-o-s$, Skr. dêv-a-s (a god) = L. div-u-s, \&c., and a secondary suffix in Skr. dâuhitr-a-s (filiæ natus) from St. duhitar, Gr. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \mu o ́ \nu-\eta$ from St. $\dot{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \mu \circ \nu$, \&c. ; $y a$ is a primary suffix in Skr. madh-ya-s = Gr. $\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma o s$ (for $\mu \varepsilon \theta-y 0-\varsigma$ ) $=$ L. med-iu-s, Gr. $\mu о i ̄ \rho \alpha$ $=\mu \circ \rho-y a$, L. exim-iu-s, \&c., and a secondary suffix in Skr. pit? $-y a-s=$ Gr. $\pi a ́ \tau \rho-\iota-o s$, L. patr-ia, \&c.
III. Stems formed by the union of two other stems are such as Gr. 入oyo- $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ á $\phi o-s$, Skr. ûrna-vâbha-s (a spider), \&c. Schleicher supposes that such compound stems existed in Indo-European, and adduces as examples I. E. svastar (soror), and svakura (socer).
§. 101. As there was a period when Indo-European con-

[^71]sisted merely of roots, so there was subsequently another period when it consisted merely of stems.*

The nominal suffixes -ant and -tar are found in all the I. E. languages, and consequently must have existed in the original Indo-European. Now if ant is composed of the two pronominal suffixes $a n$ and $t a$, and tar of the two $t a$ and $r a$, bharanta, dâtara must have been the original forms of the stems bharant, dâtar; and if the case-endings had already existed, we would have found such forms as bharanta-s (nom. sing.) in place of bharanta-s (= Gr. ф́́ $\rho \omega \nu$, L. ferens, \&c.), bharanta-sya (gen. sing.) in place of bharant-as (= Gr. фદ́povтos, L. ferentis, \&c.), dâtara-s (nom. sing.) in place of dâtar-s, dâtara-i (loc. sing.) in place of dâtar-i, \&c. Now although it is possible to suppose that bharants came from bharantas from analogy with later formations, yet it is impossible to derive the oblique cases bharantas, dâtari, \&c., from bharantasya, dâtarai, \&c., and therefore before the oblique case-endings were attached, these stems must have already lost their final vowel.
§. 102. We have remarked that in the earliest stage of Indo-European there was no distinction between the noun and verb. In its latest stage, however, this distinction was sharply marked, firstly, by the form, and secondly, by the syntactical construction of each, the verb requiring as its complementary case an accusative, and the noun requiring a genitive. In Vedic even still many nouns, following the analogy of the verb, are construed with the accusative.

[^72]
## CHAPTER VIII.

## Substantives.

§. 103. All the Indo-European words are either nouns or verbs. Nouns include substantives, adjectives, pronouns, and numerals. Prepositions, adverbs, and particles were originally cases of nouns or verbal forms. No nominal stem can be used as a word; the only example of the pure stem being found independently is the vocative case, but this case is not properly a word, being only an interjection. The stem, subject only to euphonic changes, occurs in the beginning of compounds, as the representative of all the cases, and consequently it has been called casus generalis: thus we have Skr. g'alamuch (a cloud), from St. g'ala (water), and much (to pour), Skr. rathas'âla (a coach-house), from St. ratha (a coach) and s'âla (a house), Skr. as'varûpa (having the form of a horse), from St. as'va (a horse) and rûpa (shape), Gr. doyo-
 $\nu v \kappa т$ and $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon ́ p a, G r . \mu a \kappa \varrho o ́ \theta v \mu o s ~ f r o m ~ S t . ~ \mu а к р о ~ a n d ~ \theta v \mu o ́ s, ~$ L. longimanus from St. longo and manus, L. tubicen from St. tuba and cano.

In Sanskrit when a noun has two stems, the weaker is always employed in compounds, as in pitrrâg'a-s (the God Yama, lit. the king of the Manes) from pitr the weak form of the stem pitar; and when a noun has three stems, strong, intermediate, and weak, the intermediate is the one always employed in these forms. The Sanskrit grammarians treat as the true form of the nominal stem that which is found at the beginning of compounds.
§. 103. There were three numbers in Indo-European,
singular, dual, and plural. The dual is of later formation than the plural and derived from it, as is proved by the forms of its case-endings. In Pâli the dual is found only in the words for two and both, while in Prâkrit it is entirely lost. It did not occur in Æolic Greek, and is lost in Modern Greek. In Latin it is only found in $d u o$ and ambo (nom. and acc. masc. and neut.); the feminine and the other cases of these two words are treated as plurals : even duos and ambos are found in the oldest poets, beside $d u o$ and $a m b o$; the neuter $d u a$ was used in vulgar Latin, and finally crept into the literary language, as in post dua lustra (Orestis trag. 26). There is no trace of the dual in Umbrian ; N. U. dur (two) has assumed the plural ending.
§. 104. There were three genders in Indo-European, masculine, feminine, and neuter; the last was called kliva (an eunuch) by the Sanskrit grammarians. In Semitic and Hamitic, the latter including Egyptian, Ethiopian, Libyan, and Hottentot, we only find two genders, masculine and feminine, while no distinction* of gender is found in Tataric (Tungusian, Mongolian, Turkish, Samoyedic, Finnic), the monosyllabic languages (Chinese, \&c.), the isolated languages (in Europe, Basque, in Asia, Japanese, \&c.), the Polynesian, Australian, African, and American languages.

The distinction of gender was of course unknown to the

* "It is not accidental (writes C. R. Lepsius, Standard Alphabet, 2nd Ed. p. 89), but very significant, that as far as I know, without any essential exception, only the most highly civilized races-the leading nations in the history of mankind-distinguish throughout the genders, and that the gender-languages are the same as those which scientifically, by linguistic reasons, may be proved as descending from one original Asiatic stock. The development of peculiar forms for the grammatical genders proves a comparatively higher consciousness of the two sexes ; and the distinction not only of the masculine and feminine, as in the Semitic and Hamitic languages, but also of the feminine and neuter gender, exclusively expressed in the Japhetic branch, is only a further step in the same direction."

Indo-European in its radical stage, just as it is at present unknown to radical languages, such as Chinese, \&c. Such a distinction was impossible when language consisted merely of roots placed in juxtaposition. Moreover, at the period when verbal suffixes first made their appearance, the difference of gender was not marked, for had it been so, it would have shown itself in the verb, just as the same distinction appears in the Semitic verb, proving that in this latter case the difference of gender was marked before the introduction of the verbal suffixes. The early introduction of the verbal suffixes in Indo-European also appears from the fact that they must have been introduced before the difference of number was marked in the noun, for had there existed at that period a plural suffix, we would have found it in the verb instead of such forms as I. E. -masi, -tvasi (or -tasi), -anti, (or -nti)* for the suffixes of the first, second, and third persons plural respectively.

We find traces on all sides that originally there was no distinction between the masculine and feminine gender in IndoEuropean ; e. g. the words for father and mother are formed with the same suffix ( $\Rightarrow$ I. E. - tar) in all the Indo-European family of languages. The introduction of the neuter gender took place at a period subsequent to that of the introduction of the masculine and feminine. That these three genders were all, however, introduced before the first separation occurred among the Indo-Europeans, is obvious from the agreement respecting them that pervades the whole I. E. family of languages. Various methods $\dagger$ were adopted of marking the difference of gender as well in Indo-European as in the languages that sprang from it.

[^73]
## I. By a Change of Stem.

While no attempt was made to distinguish the gender of diphthongal and consonantal stems, those in $-a,-i$, and $-u$, were lengthened to $-\hat{a},-\hat{\imath}$, and $-\hat{u}$, to express the feminine, although this method was only very partially carried out in the $i$ and $u$-stems, and there are some important exceptions in those in $-a$. In Sanskrit, where the majority of stems in $-\hat{\imath}$ and $-\hat{u}$ are feminine, we find many both masculine and feminine as papî-s (the sun) nrtû-s (a dancer), \&c., as well as stems, formed from such roots as $d h \hat{\imath}$ (to think), $l \hat{u}$ (to cut), \&c., such as s'uddha-dhî-s (a man of pure thought), yavalû-s (a corn-cutter), \&c. Besides we find numerous feminine stems, as well as masculine, in $-i$ and $-u$; e. g. mati-s (fem. thought), s'ucchi-s (fem. bright), $m r d u-s$ (fem. soft). The feminines of adjectives in $-u$ may also be formed by adding $\hat{\imath}$, as $m r d u \hat{\imath}$ (nom. fem.), \&c., except when two consonants precede, as in pându-s (fem. pale), \&c. Some adjectives in $-u$ lengthen this vowel in the feminine, as pângû-s (fem. lame from St. pängu), kurû-s (a female Kuru) from St. kuru, \&c. The allocation of the $\breve{\alpha}$-stems to the masculine, and the $\hat{\alpha}$-stems to the feminine, was better carried out than that of the $i$ - and $u$-stems; yet we find $\breve{a}$ in such feminine forms as Skr. s'ivayâ (instr. sing. of s'ivâ), \&c., and $\hat{a}$ in Skr. s'ivât (abl. sing. masc. and neut. of s'iva), \&c. In Greek we find masculine stems in $-a(\eta, \bar{a})$ and feminine ones in $-\breve{a}(o)$. Thus we have as masculines, $\nu \varepsilon a v i a ́ s$, , $i \pi \pi o ́ t \eta \varsigma$,
 names for a road, except $\delta$ $\sigma \tau \varepsilon \nu \omega \pi \sigma_{\rho} ; \dot{\eta} \nu \eta \eta_{\sigma o s, ~ a n d ~ t h e ~}^{\text {a }}$ special names of islands, such as $\hat{\eta} \Lambda_{\varepsilon} \sigma \beta$ og, \&e. ; names denoting a collection, such as $\dot{\eta}$ iँ $\pi \pi$ os (a body of cavalry), $\dot{\eta}$

[^74]$\delta \rho o ́ \sigma o s$ (the dew), \&c. ; $\dot{\eta} \lambda i \theta_{\text {os* }}{ }^{*}$ (a precious stone); \&c. In Latin we also find masculine stems in $\bar{a}$, and feminine ones in $\breve{a}(o, u)$. Thus we have as masculines, poeta, scriba, collega, terrigena, \&c., which originally ended in $\bar{a}$, although in classical Latin this $\bar{a}$ has been shortened to $\breve{a}$, just as in Greek we find the Epic forms $i \pi \pi \kappa_{o}^{\tau} \tau \breve{a}, \nu \varepsilon \phi \varepsilon \lambda \eta \gamma \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon ́ \tau a ̆$ for $i \pi \pi o ́ \tau \eta \varsigma, \nu \varepsilon-$ $\phi \varepsilon \lambda \eta \gamma \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon ́ \tau \eta s:$ and as feminines we have domus, nurus, alvus, carbasus, malus (the apple tree), pomus (id.), Corinthus, $S a-$ guntus, \&c., along with many words borrowed from the Greek, such as atomus, antidotus, dialectus, diametrus, \&c. There was some irregularity among the Romans in their use of the different genders: two forms of the same word often coexisted, as ramenta beside ramentum, caementa beside caernentum, vinus (vinus mihi in cerebrum abiit) beside vinum, \&c.; on inscriptions we find eum sepulchrum, hunc munimentum, Corinto deleto, \&c., which prove that in vulgar Latin the distinction of the genders was often lost; moreover, in classical Latin many stems in -0 are both masculine and feminine, such as colus (the distaff), papyrus, pampinus (the vine), barbitos (the lyre), \&c. ; vulgus, originally a masculine $\breve{a}$-stem, is sometimes masculine but generally neuter.

In Græco-Italic timest the masculine and neuter of adjectives in $-o s,-a,-o m$, were distinguished from the feminine by the former changing the original $a$ into $o$ : thus we have Gr. véos (m.), ขéov (n.), L. novos (m.), later novus, novom (n.), later novum beside Gr. véa (f.) and L. nova (f.).

* $\dot{\delta} \lambda i \theta$ os is any stone, but Homer twice uses $\dot{\eta} \lambda$. for $\dot{\partial} \lambda$. Names of precious stones are in general feminine, but we find $\dot{\delta}$ and $\dot{\eta} \sigma \mu \alpha \alpha_{\rho a y} \delta o s$.
$\dagger$ See Grundriss der lateinischen Declination von Franz Bücheler (p. 4), where he remarks that the tendency of feminines to retain the older grammatical forms shows itself also in adjectives whose stems ended in $-r i$, e. g. Fem. celeris, equestris, salubris, Masc. celer, equester, saluber, where the helping vowel $e$ was inserted after the loss of the final $-i s$.


## II. By different Case Suffixes.

$S$ was added to the stem to mark the nominative of the masculine and feminine genders, while the nominative neuter was represented by the mere stem, or in the case of the $\breve{a}$ stems, by the stem $+m$. In Indo-European times this $s$ was already dropped in the nom. fem. of the $\bar{a}$-stems, as Skr. nav $\hat{a}=$ Gr. v£́a $=$ L. nova. In Sanskrit it is also dropped in the case of polysyllabic feminine $\bar{\imath}$-stems, as balin̂ (fem. strong), except lakshmî-s (the wife of Vishnu), tarî-s (a boat), avî-s (mulier menstrualis, lit. not desiring), tantrî-s (a lute), stari-s (smoke). In Greek and Latin $s$ is also dropped in the nominative of feminine $i$-stems, but new suffixes are introduced in its stead, such as $-a,-\delta \delta$ in Greek, -cs in Latin, \&c. Sis kept in feminine $\bar{u}$-stems in Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, as Skr. vadhî-s (a wife), bhû-s (earth), Gr. $\delta \rho \bar{v} s, \sigma u ̈ c, ~ L . ~ s u ̄ s . * ~$

The nominative neuter of $\breve{a}$-stems was formed by adding $m$ to the stem, as Skr. navam = Gr. $\nu \mathfrak{k} o v=\mathrm{L}$. novom, \&c. In other cases the mere stem, subject to the euphonic laws peculiar to each language, was used as the nom. neut.: thus the following stems act as nominatives neuter, Skr. vâri (water), $m r d u$ (soft), sumanas (benevolent), \&c., Gr. ${ }^{\prime} \delta \rho \iota$ (ex-
 $\tau \in \rho a \varsigma$ for $\tau \varepsilon \rho a \tau$, \&c., L.mare for mari, facile for facili, genu, caput, cor for cord, corpus, \&c. Gr. $\gamma \bar{\eta} \rho a \varrho$ is neuter, but the corresponding Skr. stem g'aras $\dagger$ (old age) is feminine; similarly in Latin vulgus (nearly always neut.) and virus (neut.) correspond to Skr. varga-s (masc. a multitude), and visha-s (masc.

[^75]poison). In Latin the masc. $-s$ has frequently penetrated into the neut.; thus prudens (St. prudent), concors (St. concord), dives (St. divit), ferens (St. ferent), are both masc. and neut. The Greek does not permit this confusion of the genders, for we find $\phi$ 白 $\rho o \nu$ for $\phi \varepsilon \rho \circ \nu \tau, \tau \iota \theta \leqslant \nu$ for $\tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \nu \tau, \chi a \rho i \varepsilon \nu$ for $\chi$ дрıєит beside L. ferens, \&c. In Greek, however, we find two neuter nominatives lengthened, although no $-s$ could have been lost, viz. $\pi \tilde{v} \rho$ from St. $\pi \breve{v} \rho$, and $\pi \tilde{a} \nu$ from St. $\pi a \nu \tau$.
$D$ is used as a neuter suffix in the pronominal declension; it appears as $t$ in Sanskrit, but the Latin, Gothic, and German forms prove* that the I. E. form was d. In Sanskrit we find this $t$ in yat (which), tat (it), êtat (this), tyat (this) from ta + yat, Ved. kat $($ which $)=$ Skr. kim, it (an old neuter $=$ L. id, Goth. ita), found in $k^{\prime} \hat{e} t \dagger$ (even, if) $=k^{\prime} a$ (and) $+i t$, and in nêt (lest) $=n a($ not $)+i t$, anyat (aliud), itarat $\ddagger$ (aliud). We find on the other hand Z. nôid (lest) = Skr. nêt, Z. kad (quod) = Ved. $k a t, \mathrm{Gr}$. ö $\tau \tau \iota=\frac{\delta \delta}{\delta}+\tau \iota$, L. aliud, alid ( $=$ aliud), istud, id, illud, Goth. ita (it), G. das, was, in which $s$ points back to an older $t$, which represents an I. E. $d$ according to Grimm's law.
$A$ was the Indo-European case-suffix for the nom. pl. neuter : thus we have Z. madhva (or madhava) = Gr. $\mu^{\prime} \theta v a$ from St. madhu = Gr. $\mu \dot{\imath} \theta \mathrm{v}, \mathrm{Z} . n a m a n a=$ L. nomina, Z. dâta (gifts) from St. datě, Gr. $\delta \bar{\omega} \rho a$ from St. $\delta \omega \rho о$, тádava from St. $\tau a \lambda a \nu$, 'ípıa from St. i¿ $\rho \iota$, L. dona, maria, capita, Goth. nam$n a$ (names) $=\mathrm{L}$. nomina, \&c. In Sanskrit this $a$ became $i$; as in nâmâni $=\mathrm{L}$. nomina, madhu-n-i from St. madhu, dânâ-n-i from St. dâna $=$ L. dōno, \&c.

The genitive singular of masculine and neuter $\breve{a}$-stems ends

* Bopp (Kritische Grammatik der Sanskrita-Sprache, p. 173, note) supports the view that the I. E. form of this suffix was $t$, and he considers the Gothic forms to be exceptions to Grimm's law.
+ Benfey connects Gr. кai with k'êt : кai would then be derived from an older kati. Wilson derives Skr. k'êt from R. k'it (to think).
$\ddagger$ Beside itarat we also find Ved. itaram (nom. neut.), which may te compared with L. iterum.
in $-s y a$, whereas that of the feminine $\bar{a}$-stems ends in $-s$; thus we have Skr. as'vasya (gen. sing. masc.) from St. as'va, Gr. iँ imoıo for imaooıo beside Skr. as'vâyâs (gen. sing. fem.) from St. as'vâ, Gr. $\chi{ }^{\omega} \rho \bar{\rho} \bar{a}_{s}$ from St. $\chi \omega \rho \bar{a}$.


## III. By a Change of the Stem after the Separation of the various Indo-European Languages from each other.

Thus Sanskrit masculine and neuter stems in $-i$ and $-u$ insert an euphonic $n$ before $\hat{a}$ the instrumental case-ending, as in kavinâ, from St. kavi (masc. a poet), vâriṇ̂a from St. vâri (neut. water), bhânunâ from St. bhânu (masc. the sun), tâlunâ from St. tâlu (neut. the palate) beside gatyâ from gati (fem. motion), and dhênvâ from dhênu (fem. a milch cow). Sanskrit $a$-stems also insert an euphonic $n$ in the masc. and neut. instr., but they shorten the final $\hat{a}$, and change $\breve{a}$ of the stem into $\hat{e}$, as in s'ivêna from St. s'iva (masc. the god S'iva), gâtrêna from St. gâtra (neut. a limb), beside s'ivayâ = s'ivê $+\hat{a}$ from St. siv $\hat{a}$ (fem. propitious). In the Veda we find instrumental forms without the euphonic $n$, as mahitvana from St. mahitvana (neut. greatness), madhvâ from St. madhu (neut. honey), \&c. We also find in the Veda such instr. forms as svapnayâ from St. svapna (masc. sleep), kulis'ênâ from St. kulis' $a$ (masc. and neut. an axe).

In forming the genitive of Sanskrit $i$ - and $u$ - stems, we gunate these vowels, and add merely $s$ for masc. stems, while for fem. stems we either form the genitive as in the masc. or we simply add $\hat{a} s$ to the stem, and for neut. stems we insert $n$ before the final as; thus we have kavês, gatês or gatyâs, varinas, bhânôs, dhênôs or dhênvâs, tâlunas as genitives of the stems kavi, gati, vâri, bhânu, dhênu, tâlu. In the Veda, however, we find sometimes the older form of the genitive, without either the gunation of the vowel, or the insertion of $n$, as pas'v-as from St. pas'u (masc. cattle), madhv-as ( $=\mathrm{Gr} . \mu_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon} \theta v$-os) from madhu (neut.), ary-as from St. ari (an enemy), as in Gr. i̊eı-os from St. iסpı.

The above insertion of $n$ in the instrumental was not IndoEuropean, for we find in Zend $a s^{\prime} p a=$ Skr. $a s^{\prime} v e ̂ n a$, pas'va = Yed. pas'vâ from St. pas'u. Similarly the gunation of $i$ and $u$ in the gen. of masc. and fem. stems, and the insertion of $n$ in neuter ones, was not original, as is proved by the Greek forms $\pi i ́ t v o s(f e m.) \pi \dot{\eta} \chi$ vos (masc.) $\mu$ é $\theta$ vos (neut.) íopoos (masc. fem. and neut.) $\pi$ óбוos (masc.) ; the gunation of the genitives of the $i$ - and $u$-stems, however, occurred before the separation of the Sanskrit from the Zend, or else the same course was pursued independently by each of these languages. The Gothic and Lithuanian present the same gunation of $i$ and $u$, as in Goth. sunaus $=$ Lith. sūnaus $=$ Skr. sûnôs from St. sunu (masc.), Goth. anstais from St. ansti (favor), Lith. awēs, from St. awi (a sheep) : these forms, on the other hand, support the opinion that the above gunation of $i$ and $u$ was Indo-European.

## IV. By a Change of Case-endings, originally identical.

Thus in Indo-European the case suffix of the acc. pl. was $-n s$, while in Sanskrit masc. stems dropped the $s$, and feminine stems the $n$, the preceding vowel in each case, if short, being lengthened to compensate for the loss of the consonant: consequently we have s'ivân, kavin, bhânûn, as accs. pl. of the masc. stems s'iva, kavi, bhânu, and s'ivâs, gatîs, dhênûs, as accs. pl. of the fem. stems s'ivâ, gati, dhênu.
V. By the Formation of special Stems, especially for the Feminine Gender.

Long $i$ was perhaps used as a feminine suffix in the IndoEuropean; in Sanskrit its use as such is very common, as in dêvî (nom. fem. a goddess), from St. dêva (a god), dhanavatî (nom. fem. rich) from St. dhanavant, laghvi (nom. fem. light), from St. laghu, svâdvî (nom. fem. sweet), from St. svâdu, dâtr̂̀
(nom. fem. a giver) from St. dâtar. In Greek this $i$ also appears in feminine forms, but its exact signification seems to have been lost, and consequently $a$ was added to express the feminine more definitely: thus we have $\dot{\eta} \delta \varepsilon i a \quad$ for $\hat{\eta} \delta_{\&} F \iota a$ beside Skr. svâdvî̀ from St. $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta \boldsymbol{v}=$ Skr. svâdu ; סóts! $\rho a$ for $\delta o r \varepsilon \rho y a=$


 $\pi о \nu y \alpha$; $\boldsymbol{\pi}$ ótvta beside Skr. patn̂̂ (nom. fem. a wife) ; aै $\nu a \sigma \sigma a$ for ávaкya beside aैva $\boldsymbol{\xi}$; \&c. We also find $\delta$ added in Greek



 ros, \&c. Many Greek masculines have two feminines of both
 ò $\rho \chi \eta \sigma \tau \rho i ́ a$ and $\grave{\rho} \chi \eta \sigma \tau \rho i ́ \varsigma ~ f r o m ~ o ̀ \rho \chi \eta \sigma \tau \eta ́ \rho ; ~ o ̀ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \tau \varepsilon є \rho a ~ a n d ~ o ̀ \lambda \varepsilon ́ \tau \iota \varsigma ~$
 or aù $\lambda \eta \tau \dot{\eta} s$. In Latin $i$ is found in feminine stems, but new stems were formed by the addition of $c$, as victrix from St. victrīc, genetrix from St. genetrīc beside Skr. g'anitrî (nom. fem. a mother), \&c. This formative $c$ has been identified by some writers with $k$ in Gr. $\gamma$ vvackós, but this is very unlikely. Curtius

[^76]considers that the I. E. stem was ganaki, which is very probable, as we find Skr. g'anaka-s (a father). Bopp supposes that yuvaıkmeant originally "the figure of a woman," and derives it from
 $\varepsilon \lambda o s$, \&c. It is very doubtful whether $a$ was ever added in Latin to form new feminine stems in $-a$ from original ones in $-\bar{l}$, but some Latin words apparently point to such forms: thus gallina appears to bear the same relation to gallus that $\theta_{\text {eaiiva }}$ does to 0 éos, and if so, it must be for gallaina; Diana or Deana, which is found on an inscription, may be for Deaina, a feminine similarly formed from deus; regina may likewise be for regaina, a feminine of rex. If gallaina, Deaina, regaina ever existed, they were probably for gallantya, Deantya, regantya, just as $\lambda_{\text {éalva }}$ is for $\lambda_{\varepsilon a \nu \tau y a}$ beside St.入єovt.
§. 105. There were nine cases in Indo-European. These were the nominative (casus* rectus), accusative, locative, dative, ablative, genitive, $\dagger$ two instrumentals and vocative. The last of these, though not properly a case, and generally in the singular represented by the mere stem, I nevertheless enumerate among the cases, following the common custom of doing so. These nine cases are only distinguished from each other in the singular : in the dual there are only three different caseendings, one for nom. acc. and voc., another for gen. and loc. and a third for dat. abl. and both inst. s : in the plural the

* Casus is a translation merely of Gr. $\pi \tau \tilde{\omega} \pi \iota \varsigma$, which meant the inclination that one idea had to another, and which was expressed by the case-ending. The nominative was called rectus ( $\varepsilon \dot{v} \theta \varepsilon \tilde{\varepsilon} a, \dot{j} \rho \theta \dot{\eta})$ because it stood erect at the beginning of the sentence, and did not depend on anything: consequently some grammarians did not consider it to be strictly a casus. The Sanskrit term for a case-ending is vibhakti (division), Pân. I. 4, 104; v. 3, 1, sq.
$\dagger$ The Greek term for genitive is $\gamma \varepsilon \nu t \kappa \eta$, which meant casus generalis. Genetivus is properly equivalent to yєvขךrıкウ́ and is a mistaken translation of $\gamma \in \nu t \times \dot{\eta}$.
nom. and voc. agree in form, so do the dat. and abl., while there is only one instr.

The question now suggests itself,* what are the relative ages of these cases? This is a question that in the present state of our knowledge can only be partially answered. The cases at once divide themselves into two groups, $\dagger$ the first consisting of the nominative, accusative, and vocative, and the second of all the rest. That the nom. acc. and voc. are closely connected together, is shown by the facts, that in the neuter they are generally all identical, and that they are never interchanged with any case belonging to the second division, while these latter cases frequently interchange with one another: e. g. in Sanskrit the ablative and genitive frequently agree in form, so do the genitive and locative dual ; the instrumental is represented in Greek by the dative, and in Latin by the ablative ; $-b i$ is locative in L. $u b i, i b i$, and dative in L. tibi, this connexion of the loc. with the dat. is easily understood, for the sentence, "You gave the book to me" (dative), is equivalent to "The place where you deposited the book was I" (locative); again, the genitive and dative are closely allied, for "she is my daughter" has the same meaning as "she is daughter to me ;" \&c. $\ddagger$

* Consult Curtius zur Chronologie der indogermanischen Sprachforschung, p. 250, seq., whose views I have followed in the text.
$\dagger$ Grassmann (über die casusbildung in indogermanischen in K. Z. xir. p. 241, seq.), also divides the cases into these same two groups. The first group are formed from the stem by the addition of what he calls die deutende ankänge, and the second, by the addition of die zeigende anhänge : die deutende are $-s,-d,-a,-a m$, and are all of pronominal origin, die $z e i g e n d e$ are $-a s,-a t,-i n,-a n a,-b h i,-a b h i,-a v$, and are derived from prepositions; these latter, he says, only enter in those cases where a prepositional origin is probable, and where prepositions are used to a great extent in Greek, Latin, German, and almost entirely in the Romance languages and English. Ahrens calls the genitive, dative, and accusative, the three logical cases, and he justifies his use of this name by the relation in which this triad stands to the three chief classes of words, substantives, adjectives, and verbs.
$\ddagger$ So in Pâli and Prâkrit mayham dhitu and mama dhítu both mean

The vocative is the oldest of all the cases, and was originally merely the stem itselfused as an interjection: e. g. Skr. siva (masc.) is both the voc. and the stem, Gr. $\pi \rho^{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma v$ is both the voc. and the stem which is found in $\pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \beta v-\gamma \varepsilon v \eta \eta^{\prime} s$. Next to the vocative the accusative, called by Curtius the case with the $M$-suffix, was developed; the suffix probably only acted the part of an article, and was merely intended to call attention to the word to which it was attached. That the case with the $M$ - suffix is older than the case with the $S$-suffix, (afterwards the nominative) appears firsty from the fact, that the nominative of the pronouns frequently ends in $m$, as Skr. aham, tvam, ayam, iyam, idam, Gr. $\bar{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega \boldsymbol{\nu}$, Bœot. тov́v, L. idem, and secondly from the very extended use of the accusative which is used in so many different relations, and which consequently must have existed for a long period by itself.*

When the case with the $M$-suffix had been for some time in use, the want of a suffix, which should distinguish the animy daughter where mayham $=$ Skr. mahyam (dative), and mama $=$ Skr. mama (genitive). In modern Greek also we find the genitive used for the dative, as in $\sigma \tilde{v} \lambda^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ (I say to thee); in Constantinople and Athens, however, where the best Modern Greek is spoken, $\sigma \dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega$ is used in this sense, while in printed books $\sigma 0 i \lambda_{\hat{\varepsilon} \gamma \omega}^{\prime}$ is used.

* Madvig, in his Latin Grammar (§ 222, Obs. 1, p. 197, Fourth English Edition), explains the connexion of the accusative with the infinitive, on the ground that the accusative, as the indefinite case, was naturally joined to the indefinite infinitive expression. "The accusative," he writes, "is originally the word without further definition or distinction. In the masculine and feminine a peculiar form, the nominative has been devised, in order to denote the word as a subject (or as the predicative noun), but in the neuter, the accusative is also nominative. The accusative, therefore (as an indefinite case), is used in the most simple way, in which a word is alded, to define and complete the predicate expressed in the verb. In the indefinite infinitive expression, where the connexion between the subject and predicate is not of itself asserted, the subject and the predicative noun stand in the accusative, e. g. hominem currere, that a man runs; esse dominum, to be lord." The derivation of the nominative in the Romance languages from the Latin accusative, as Fr. père from L. patrem, It. domino from L. dominum, supports this view of the nature of the accusative.
mate from the inanimate, began to make itself felt, and the $S$ suffix was consequently introduced to satisfy the want. This $S$ was used to mark both masculines and feminines, and was evidently derived from the pronominal root $s a$ (he, she).

In the same period, during which the $M$ - and $S$-suffixes were being developed, also arose the $D$-suffix to mark the neuter of the pronouns. The introduction of this latter suffix probably occurred between that of the $M$ - and that of the $S$ suffix.

For a long period the Indo-European was content with the three cases noticed above, the Vocative, Accusative, and Nominative ; but gradually there arose the necessity of new case-endings to express different ideas, and the remaining cases began to develope themselves. Among these the genitive singular appears to be the oldest; it originally ended in -sya, a suffix which is found in Gr. סŋ $\mu$ ó- $\sigma \iota-\varsigma$, and which, perhaps, arose from an older -tya.* This form was evidently of adjectival origin, and it is probable that adjectives in -sya were used to denote the notion afterwards expressed by the genitive in early times, even before the introduction of the $M$ and $S$ - suffixes : in Greek we find one adjective in -sya, viz., $\delta \eta \mu o ́ \sigma \iota o s$, the stem of which $\delta \eta \mu \sigma \sigma \iota o$ is the original of the Epic genitive סímoo. The other genitive suffix -as is connected by Curtius $\dagger$ with the same pronominal root sa from which the nominative suffix $S$ is derived, and consequently points back to an older -asa: the original form of I. E. gen. vâk-as (Skr. vâk'-as, L. voc-is) was accordingly râk-asa, just as the original form of I. E. nom. svana-s (L. sonu-s) was svana$s a$. The compound vâk-asa, in Curtius' view, is therefore related to svana-sa, as a Tatpurusha compound in Sanskrit

[^77](i. e. one in which the last word governs the preceding one, as tatpurusha-s, his man, where St. tat is used for gen. sing. tasya, kumbla-kâra-s, a maker of pots, from St. kumbha, a pot) is to a Karmadhâraya (i. e. a compound in which the first part is the predicate of the second part, as nila-utpalam, the blue lotus, from St. nilla, blue), vâk-a-sa being thus equivalent
 first case governing the noun, and in the second, being only in apposition; and consequently vâkasa stanasa in conjunction would mean the sound of the roice, vâkasa being used in an adjectival sense, and literally meaning vocal. The two objections that can be brought against this view of the genitive are first, that the $a$ which occurs before sa in vâkasu is left unaccounted for, and second, that, while the combination vâkasa svanasa (= vocis sonus) is quite comprehensible, vâklasa svanama ( $=$ vocis sonum) is not so, but that we should expect vâkama svanama. The first of these objections is of little importance, for $a$ may be merely an adventitious element similar to $n$, that is inserted so frequently in Skr. gen. pl. as in dêvâ$n$ - $\hat{a}$, vadh $\hat{u}-n$ - $\hat{a}$, mâtr$\hat{r}-n$-am, \&\&., from the stems dêva, vadhû, mâtr, \&ic. ; or to $i$ that is inserted in the loc. pl. of Skr. $a$ stems, as in s'ivêshu $=s^{\prime} i v a-i-s h u$ from St. s'iva. The second objection is of more importance, and different methods of obviating it may be adopted : the simplest explanation seems to be that these adjectival forms in -sya and -asa are relics of that period when language had only arrived at the stage of stems, and that, when their true explanation had been lost, they became genitives after the introduction of the $M$ - and $S$ suffixes, for before these latter suffixes were introduced, the conception of the genitive could not have been formed. Curtius compares this ancient genitive with the L. cujus, which is used not only as genitive, but also declined like an adjective, as cujus puer, cuja puella, cujum pecus.

In the present state of our knowledge, it appears impossible
to advance farther in the chronological arrangement of the cases.

## Sanskrit Consonantal Stems.

§. 106. As the case-endings were originally the same for all stems, we properly cannot speak of different declensions, but only of different stems. We therefore, classifying stems according to their final sounds, divide them into consonantal and vocalic.* The declension of stems, ending in $i, \hat{\imath}, u, \hat{u}$, or a diphthong, agrees in many respects with that of those ending in a consonant; this arises partly from the fact that the vowels $i$ and $u$ are closely related to the spirants $j$ and $v$, and are easily interchanged with them. Consonantal stems in Sanskrit generally end in $n, t, s$, and $r$; the other consonants are found only in root-stems or those of uncertain origin.
§. 107. Guttural Stems.-These are found much more frequently in Greek and Latin than in Sanskrit. In Greek we find gutturals ending both root-stems and those of uncertain origin, as $\phi \lambda o \gamma, \phi \rho \iota \kappa, \dot{o} \nu v \chi$, корак, \&c.; and in Latin we find the mending not only root-stems, as $d u c$, reg, leg, \&c., but also formative suffixes, as vor-ac, ed-ac, geni-tric, junic, \&c. In Sanskrit we have sarvas'ak (omnipotent, nom. sing sarvas'ak, $\dagger$

* Grassmann (K. Z. xir. p. 241) divides Indo-European stems into those that end in a consonant or root-vowel and those that add a stemvowel before the case-endings. The declension of the first class of stems he calls the first declension, and that of the second, the second declensiun.
$\dagger$ Sarvas'ak (nom. sing.) is for sarvas'ak $+s$, because two consonants are never allowed to end a word in Sanskrit, the last being always rejected, except when the one before the last is $r$ (after which every consonant is kept, except sh ( $=s$ of desiderative forms) as $\hat{u} r k$, nom. sing. of St. $\hat{u} \mathrm{u}^{\prime} \mathrm{g}^{\prime}$ (strong). The nom. sing. of St. kitralikh is kitralik for k'itralikh $+s$, final $s$ being first rejected, and then $k h$ becoming $k$, as in Sanskrit only tenues are allowed to end a word, aspirates and mediæ consequently having to pass into the corresponding tenues, in the guttural, cerebral, dental, and labial rows, as $k k, g, g h$, into $k$. No palatal can end a word ; $k^{\prime}, g^{\prime}, g^{\prime} h$, generally become $k$, and $k^{\prime} h$ becomes $!$.
from sarca, all, and s'ak, to be able), suvalg (going well, nom. sing. suval, from su, well, and valg, to go), k'itralikh (a painter, nom. sing. k'itralik, from k'itra, a picture, and likh, to paint), lih (licking. nom. sing. lit), guh (covering, nom. sing ghut), upânah (a shoe, nom. sing. upânat, from upa $=$ Gr. $\boldsymbol{v} \pi o ́ ~ a n d ~$ $n a h$, to bind), duh (milking, nom. sing. dhuk), druh (hating, nom. sing. dhrut or dhruk), \&c. No stem ends in $\ddot{i}$.
§. 108. Palatal Stems.-Vâk' (voice, nom. sing. vâk), ruk' (light, nom. sing. ruk), g'alamuk' (a cloud, nom. sing. g'alamuk, from $g^{\prime} a l a$, water, and $m u k^{\prime}$ to shed), prânk' (the east, nom. sing. prẫ̈), rug' (disease, nom. sing. ruk), samrâg' (a king, nom. sing. samrât, from sam = Gr. $\sigma$ v́v and râg' to shine), $\hat{u} r g^{\prime}$ (might, nom. sing. $\hat{u} r k)$ ), bluıg' (eating, nom. sing. bhuk), khañg' (lame, nom. sing. khân), prâk'h (asking, nom. sing. prât, from pra $=$ Gr. $\pi \rho o ́$ and I. E. ask), vis' (a man, nom. sing. vit, E. wight), dis' (a region, nom. sing. dik), \&c. There are no stems which end in $y$ or $\tilde{n}$.
§. 109. Cerebral Stems.-Dadhrsh (bold, nom. sing. dadhrk), dvish (hating, nom. sing. dvit), mrsh (bearing, nom. sing. $m r k$ ), sugan (a good reckoner, from su, well, and gan, to number, a denominative verb formed from gana, a multitude, for garna from I. E. gar, to collect, whence Gr. ả $\gamma \varepsilon i \rho \omega)$.
§. 110. Dental Stems.-Marut (the wind, nom. sing. marut), g'agat (the world, nom. sing. g'agat), bharant (= Gr. фعpove, nom. sing. bharan $=$ Gr. $\phi$ ¢́ $\rho \nu=$ L. ferens), \&c., suhrd (good-hearted, nom. sing. suhrt, from $s u=$ Gr. $\varepsilon v ้$ and $h r d=$ E. heart), pad (a foot, nom. sing. pât), kravyâd (one who eats flesh, nom. sing. kravyât, from kravya, raw flesh, Gr. крє́as, L. caro, E. raw, and ad, to eat, Gr. $\varepsilon_{\delta}^{\prime} \delta \omega$, L. edo), aranyasad (living in forests, nom. sing. aranyasat, from aranya, a forest, and $s a d$, to sit), sad (found in the dative $\hat{a}$-sad- $\hat{e}$, used as an infinitive, to place one's self), agnimath (fire-lighting, nom. sing. agnimat, from agni, fire, L. ignis and math, to agitate), path (a way), s'is'rath (found in the dative $s^{\prime} i s^{\prime} r a t h-\hat{e}$, used as an infinitive, from $s^{\prime}$ is'rath, a reduplicated form of $s^{\prime} r a t h$, to tie, to
loosen, with which Benfey connects Gr. $\kappa \lambda \omega \theta \omega$, кá $\lambda a \theta$ os, L. crates, rete, restis), budh (knowing, nom. sing. bhut), kshudh (hunger, nom. sing. kshut), yudh (war, nom. sing. yut), idh (found in the accusative sam-idh-am, used as an infinitive, to set on fire), \&c. Stems formed by the suffixes $-a s,-i s$, and $-u s$ are common, as sumanas (= Gr. є $\dot{\boldsymbol{v}} \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \varsigma$ ), k'andramas (the moon, nom. sing. k'andramâs), sug'yotis (having good light, nom. sing. sug'yotis), suk'akshus (having good eyes, nom. sing. suk'ashus), \&c. We also find stems ending in radical $s$, as pindagras (an eater of lumps, nom. sing. pindagras, from pindu, a lump, and gras, to eat), supis (walking well, nom. sing. su$p i ̂ s$ from $s u$, well, and pis to walk), sutus (well sounding, nom. sing. sut $\hat{u} s$ ), dôs (the fore-arm), \&c. Stems ending in $n$ are also common, as $s^{\prime} v a n$ (a dog, nom. sing. $s^{\prime} v a \hat{a}$ ), maghavan (a name of Indra, nom. sing. maghavâ, from maghavant, wealthy), yuvan (young, nom. sing. yuvâ), râg'an (a king, nom. sing. $\left.r \hat{a}^{\prime} g \hat{a}\right), \& c$. Stems in $r$ are also of frequent occurrence, as gir (voice, nom. sing. gîr), dvâr (a door, nom. sing. dvâr), pur (a town, nom. sing. pûr), pitar (father, nom. sing. pitâ), dâtâr (giver, nom. sing. dâtâ), \&c. No Sanskrit stem ends in $l$.
§. 111. Labial Stems.-Ap (water, only used in the plural, nom. pl. appas, acc. pl. apas, instr. pl. adbhis),* gup (guarding), kakubh (a summit or a region, nom. sing. kakup), labh (receiving, nom. sing. lap), rabh (found in the accusative rabham, used as an infinitive, to desire), div (heaven, nom. sing. dyâus from another stem dyô, acc. sing. divam), pras'âm (mild, nom. sing. pras'ân from pra = Gr. $\pi \rho o$ and s'am, to cease, connected by Benfey with Gr. кá $\mu-\nu \omega$ ), kram (found in the dative ati-kram- $\hat{e}$, used as an infinitive, to step over).
§. 112. Unchangeable and Changeable Stems.-Nouns with unchangeable stems have the same form before all the case-ter-

[^78]minations, subject only to the influence of euphonic laws;* e. g. marut (the wind) belongs to this class, and remains unchanged.

|  | Sing. | Dual. | Plural. |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| N. | marut | marut- $\hat{l} u$ | marut-as |
| A. | marut-am | marut-âu | marut-as |
| I. | marut- $\hat{a}$ | marud-bhyâm | marud-bhis |
| D. | marut- $\hat{e}$ | marud-bhyâm | marud-bhyas |
| Ab. | marut-as | marud-blyyâm | marud-bhyas |
| G. | marut-as | marut-ôs | marut-âm |
| L. | marut- $i$ | marut-ôs | marut-su |
| V | marut | marut- $\hat{a} u$ | marut-as |

Nouns with changeable stems are divided into two classes ; the first class has two stems, the second has three.

The cases of the first class are divided into the strong (called by the Indian Grammarians the Ä̈ga cases) and the weak (called by the same grammarians the Pada and Bha cases). The strong cases in masculine and feminine $\dagger$ nouns are the nom. and voc. of the three numbers, and the nom. and acc. of the singular and dual, while in neuter nouns the nom. voc. and acc. pl. are the strong cases; all the remaining cases are weak.

The cases of the second class of nouns are divided into strong (or Ä̈ga), intermediate (or Pada) and weak (or Bha). The strong stem is found in the same cases as in the nouns with only two stems; the intermediute stem is found before all case-terminations beginning with consonants, and in the nom. and acc. sing. of neuter nouns.

The strong stem is evidently the oldest form, for it is found in the three oldest cases, nom. acc. and voc. (consult §. 105),

[^79]and in Greek and Latin the strong stems are preserved much more generally than in Sanskrit, as may be seen from a comparison of the declension of the present participle, e. g. Skr. bharant (bearing) $=\mathrm{Gr} . \phi \varepsilon \rho o \nu \tau=\mathrm{L}$. ferent, the weak form of which stem is bharat :

| Sing. N. V. | Skr. bharan | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gr. } \\ \phi \notin \rho \omega \nu \end{gathered}$ | ferens |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | bharant-am | ф¢́povt-a | ferent-em |
| I. | bharat-â | - | - |
| D. | bharat-ê |  | ferent-i |
| Ab. | bharat-as | - | ferent-e |
| G. | bharat-as | $\phi$ ¢́govt-os | ferent-is |
| L. | bharat-乞̂ | - | - |

These Greek and Latin forms at once indicate that the original form of the stem was the strong one.

The declension of the participle stem bharant (masc.) illustrates that of all stems with two bases;

| Sing. | Strong cases. | Weak eases. |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :--- |
| A. | bharan |  |
| I. | bharant-am |  |
| D. | - | bharat- $\hat{a}$ |
| Ab. G. | - | bharat- $\hat{e}$ |
| L. | - | bharat-as |
| I. | - | bharat- $i$ |

Dual. N. V. A. bharant-âu
I. D. Ab.
G. L.
--
Plural. N. V.
A.
bharant-as

| A. | - |
| :--- | :--- |
| I. | - |
| D. Ab. | - |
| G. | - |
| L. | - |

bharat.as
bharad-bhis
bharad-bhyas
bharat-âm
bharat-su

## Neuter.

Strong cases. Weak cases.
Sing. N. A. V.
Dual. N. A. V.
Plural. N. A. V. bharanti.
The feminines of these participle stems* are formed by adding $\hat{\imath}$ to the weak stem, as bharatî, \&c.

The declension of the participle of the præterite active illustrates that of stems with three bases ; e. g. rurudvầns (having wept) is the strong, rurudvas the intermediate (the final $s$ of which becomes $t$ if it be either final or followed by terminations beginning with $s$ and $b h$ ), and rurudush the weak base.

Masculine.

|  | Strong. | Intermediate. | Weak. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sing. N. | rıurudvân | - | - |
| A. | rurudvâns-cm | - | - |
| I. | - | - | rurudush $\cdot$ - $\hat{b}$ |
| D. | - | - | rurudush-ê |
| Ab. G. | - | - | rurudush-cas |
| L. | - | - | rurudush-i |
| V. | rurudvan | - | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | rurudvâis-âu | - | - |
| I. D. Ab. | - | rurudvad-bhyâm | - |
| G. L. | - | - | rurudush-ồs |
| Plur. N. V. | rurudvâns-as | - | - |
| A. | - | - | rurudush-as |
| I. | - | rurudvad-bhis | - |
| I). Ab . | - | rurudvad-bliyas | - |
| G. | - | - - | rurudush-âm |
| L. | - | - | - |

[^80]Neuter.
Strong. Intermediate. Weak.
Sing. N. A. V. - rurudvat
['he others are the same as the masculine.]
Dual. N. A. V.

- rurudush-î
[The others are the same as the masculine.]
Plur. N. A. V. rurudvâns-i
[The others are the same as the masculine.]
§. 113. The most important changeable stems in Sanskrit are the following:-
I. G̛uttural.-Compound stems, whose last element is vâh (bearing), retain vâh in the strong and intermediate cases, but ruduce it to $\hat{u} h$ in the weak cases; e. g. from St. vis'vavâh (the supporter of the world) we have Sing. A. vis'vavâh-am, Pl. I. vis'vavadd-bhis, but Pl. A. vis'vâuh-as : in a similar way are declined s'âlivâh (bearing rice), bhâravâh (bearing a burden). $S^{\prime} v e ̂ t a v a ̂ h ~(a ~ n a m e ~ o f ~ I n d r a, ~ l i t . ~ d r a w n ~ b y ~ w h i t e ~ h o r s e s) ~ d i f f e r s ~$ from the preceding compounds of vâh in forming its intermediate cases from svêtavas, from which also the nom. and voc. sing. are formed, and in allowing the weak cases to be formed from either s'vêtavâh or s'vêtâuh. The feminine stems of vis'vavâh, \&c., are vis'vauhî, \&c. Anaduh (an ox, lit. a waggondrawer, from anas, a waggon and $v a ̂ h$ ) forms the nom. and voc. sing. and the nom. acc. and voc. pl. neut. from anadvâंs (the $\hat{a}$ of which becomes $a$ in voc. sing.) and the remaining strong cases from anadvâh, the intermediate from anadut and the weak from anaduh. Upânah (fem. a shoe) forms the nom. sing. and the intermediate cases from the stem upânat, as Sing. N. upânat, Dual. I. upânadbhyâm, Pl. I. upânadbhis, and the remaining cases from upânah: these forms are explained by the fact that the original form of nah (to bind) was nadh, connected perhaps with Gr. vin $\theta \omega$.
II. Palatal.-Compounds of $a \tilde{n} k^{\prime}$ (to go) have either two or three stems: e. g. prânk (directed forwards, eastern) and avânk' (directed downwards, southern, from ava; down, and $a \tilde{n} k k^{\prime}$ ) have each two stems, prân$k '$ and avân$k '$ for the strong, and $p r a \hat{k^{\prime}}{ }^{\prime}$ and avâk' for the weak cases; pratyank' (lying opposite, westward, from prati $=$ Gr. $\pi \rho o \tau_{i}^{\prime}$ and $a \tilde{n} k^{\prime}$ ), udañk' (directed upwards, northern, from $u t$, up, and $\left.a n k^{\prime}\right)$, \&c., have each three stems, pratyank', udañk', \&c., for the strong, pratyak', udak', \&c., for the intermediate, and pratîk', udîk', \&c., for the weak cases. • Yung' (binding) forms its strong cases from $y u \bar{n} g^{\prime}$ and its weak from $y u g^{\prime}$.
III. Cerebral.-Sag'ush (a companion from sa, with, and $g^{\prime} u s h$, to love) forms its strong and intermediate cases from sag'us ( $u$ also becoming $\hat{u}$ ) and only its weak cases from sag'ush.
IV. Dental.-The present and future participle stems* end in ant in the strong, and in at in the weak cases; see §. 112. for the declension of St. bharant, in a similar way to which are declined future participles, such as dâsyant $=$ Gr. $\delta \omega \sigma 0 \nu \tau$. The present participles of reduplicated verbs use the weak base throughout their whole declension, except in the Nom. Acc. and Voc. Pl. Neut., where either the strong or the weak stem may be used: e. g. g'âgrat (waking, from $g^{\prime} a ̂ g a r, ~ t o ~$ wake) and dudat (giving from dâ, to give) have as their acc. s. sing. g'âgratam and dadatam (=Gr. $\left.\delta_{i} \delta^{\prime} \dot{\nu} \tau a\right)$. G'agat (neut. the world, lit. moving, an old present participle of gam, to go) is declined like dadat (neut.), except that it only has g'aganti as nom. pl. Bṛhant or vṛhant (great) and preshant ( m . a deer and n . a drop of water) are declined like bharant; these words are however real participles, the first two being

[^81]from brh or $v r^{h} h$ (to increase) and the last, which is used in Vedic Sanskrit as an adjective, meaning speckled, being from prsh (to sprinkle). Mahant (great)* is also declined like bharant, except that the strong cases are formed from mahânt; this word is a participle of mah (to be great) = I. E. magh, whence Skr. magha (power). In Vedic we find other examples of ant becoming ânt, as in mahânt: e. g. Nom. Acc. and Voc. Pl. Neut. of the suffixes mant and vant and the present participle of as (to be) ; thus we have pas'umânti (abounding in cattle), sânti = Gr. ơvza, \&c. Stems in vant and mant are declined like bharat, except that the nom. sing mase. ends in vân and mân, whereas the nom. sing. masc. of the participles ends in an, as nom. sing. agnimân (having fire), udanvân (having water) in opposition to bharan. In Greek the vowel is lengthened in the participles, as Gr. $\phi \hat{\varepsilon} \rho \omega \nu=$ Skr. bharan $=$ L. ferens = Z. barans. Arvant $\dagger$ (m. a horse) is declined like nouns in -vant, except that the nom. sing. is arvâ, as if from a stem arvan. Kiyant (now much), iyant (so much), bhavant (Your Honour) are declined like udanvant. In Vedic we find that the vocatives of stems in -vant and -mant generally end in -vas and -mas, which point back to an older -vat and -mat.

Pâd (a foot) at the end of compounds keeps pâd in the strong and intermediate cases, but shortens it to pad in the

[^82]weak cases. The participle in -vâns* of the reduplicated preterite has three stems, as we have already seen from the declension of rurudvầns in §. 112. Comparative stems in -îyâns preserve these forms in the strong cases, but reduce them to -îyâns or -yas in the intermediate and weak cases; e. g. from yavîyầns (younger) we have nom. sing. yavîyân, acc. pl. yavîyasas, instr. pl. yavîyôbhis, \&c. The termination of the nom. sing. is $-\hat{\imath} y \hat{a} n=$ Gr. $\bar{i} \omega \nu=\mathrm{L} . \bar{i} \bar{o} r$ (the $o$ of which is only shortened when $r$ is final $=0$. L. $-i \bar{o} s$ ), all of which forms point back to -iyâns as the termination of the nom. sing. in Indo-European. The feminines of participles in -vâns and comparatives in $\hat{\imath} y \hat{a} \dot{n} s$ are formed by adding $\hat{\imath}$ to the weak base, as rurudushi, yaviyasi. Pumans $\dagger$ (a man) forms the strong cases from $p u$ mâns, the intermediate from pum and the weak from puins.

* This suffix = I. E. vant which meant having, provided with, \&c. Its use to express the idea of the perfect tense is similar to that of the auxiliary verb have in English: udanvant (having water, the ocean) is a perfectly similar form to rurudvant (having roared). We find vant in Gr.
 $\nu \iota \phi 0-\mathbf{F}_{\varepsilon \nu \tau}, \& c$., and in Lat. -osus $=-$ onsus $=-$ vant-a-s, as formōsus for formonsus, \&c. Similarly we find -vant in perf. part. in Gr. as $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{o} \pi \pi-\dot{\omega} \varsigma=$
 $=\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{o} \pi-\operatorname{For}_{\text {ot }}(\mathrm{n}):$. the only case of -vant being used to express the perfect in the Italic languages is the very doubtful one of the Oscan perfect; e. g. prüfatted, 3. sing. perf. (probavit), prüfattens, 3. pl. perf. (probaverunt) are supposed to be for prüfat-fed, prufat-fens, where fed and fens come from root $f u$ (to be) and prufat is supposed to be the participle pret. and = profa-vot, vot being = Gr. For. Consult Schleicher's Compendium, p. 834.
$\dagger$ Pumâns is derived by Benfey from api (= Gr. $\quad \underset{\pi}{ } \boldsymbol{i}$, L. ob) and man (to think) $+t$. This is a very unlikely account of the word. It is much more probable that it is derived from an old root $p u$ (with the suffix -mant) whence come Skr. pu-tra-s (a son), pô-ta-s (the young of any animal). Pu meant to grow, and from it arose in Sanskrit the secondary verb push (to nourish). This root perhaps is the origin of a very numerous class of words in Greek and Latin, as Gr. $\pi$ ais (for $\pi a \mathbf{F}-\iota \delta \varsigma$ ) for which
 $\pi о$-ía, L. pu-er, pa-pav-er, po-mum (for pov-тит), pra-pu-tium, \&c.

Stems in -an, -man, -van,* form their strong cases from $-\hat{a} n,-m a ̂ n,-v \hat{a} n$, their intermediate form $-a,-m a,-v a$, and their weak form $-n,-m n,-v n$ : e. g. râg'ân (m. a king) and nâman ( n . a name) are thus declined:
[St. râg'ân].

| N. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Sing. } \\ & \text { râg'a. } \end{aligned}$ | Dual. <br> $r a ̂ g^{\prime} a ̂ n-\hat{a} u$ | Pl. râgân-as |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | râg'ân-an | râg'ân-âu | râg'ñ-as |
| I. | râg'n- $\hat{a}$ | râg'a-bhyâm | rág'a-bhis |
| D. | râg'n-ê | râg'a-bhyâm | râg'a-bhyas |
| Ab. | râg'ñ-as | râg ${ }^{\prime} a$-bhyâm | râg'a-bhyas |
| G. | râg'ñ-as | râg'ñ-os | râg'n-âm |
| L. | râd ${ }^{\prime} \tilde{n}-i$ | rà' ${ }^{\text {n - }}$-s | râg'a-su |
| V . | rág'an | râg'ân-âu | râg'ân-as |


| N. A. V. | $n a ̂ m a$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| I. | $n a ̂ m n-\hat{a}$ |
| D. | $n a \hat{m n-\hat{e}}$ |
| Ab. | $n a ̂ m n-a s$ |
| G. | $n a ̂ m n-a s$ |
| L. | $n a \hat{m n-i}$ |

nâmn-í
nâma-lhyâm
nâma-bhyâm
nâma-bhyâm
nâmn-ôs
nâmn-ôs
nâmân-i nâma-blis nâma-bhyas nâma-bhyas
nâmn-âm
nâma-su

The locative sing. of these nouns may also be râg'ani and nâmani; the voc. sing. of nâman may also be nâman and its nom. acc. and voc. dual also nâman̂̂.

The femininest of râg'ân and similar stems are generally formed by adding $\hat{\imath}$ to the weak stem, as râg' $\hat{\imath} \hat{\imath}$ (a queen). Nouns in -vân form their feminines in -varî, as pivân (m. fat) =
 in -an, such as dâmân (f. a rope) are declined like râg'ân.

* For special peculiarities in the declension of these stems consult Bopp's Sanskrit Grammar, p. 129, seq., or Max Müller's Sanskrit Grammar, p. 85 , seq.
+ For special rules see Max Müller's Sanskrit Grammar, p. 87 , seq.

S'van (m. a dog), yuvan (m. young), and maghavan (m. a name of Indra, lit. mighty) form their strong cases from s'vân yuvân, maghavân; their intermediate from s'va, yuva, maghava; and their weak from sun, $y \hat{u} n$, maghôn.

For other examples of changeable stems in $-n$ Bopp's Sanskrit Grammar (pp. 130-134) may be consulted.

Stems in -tar and -târ form their strong cases from -tar and $-t \hat{a} r$, and the remainder from $-t r$ and $-t r$ : e. g. dâtâr (m. a giver), pitar ( m . father), mâtar (f. mother) are thus declined.

Singular.

| N. | dâtâ |
| :--- | :--- |
| A. | dâtâr-am |
| I. | dâtr- $\hat{a}$ |
| D. | dâtr-ê |
| Ab. G. | dâtur |
| L. | dâtar-i |
| V. | dâtar |


| N. A. V. dâtâr-âu | pitar-âu | mâtar-âu |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| I. D. AJ. dâtr-bhyâm | pitr-bhyâm | mâtr-bhyâm |
| G. L. dâtr-ôs | pitr-ôs | mâtr-ós |

N. V. dâtâr-as

| pitar-as | mâtar-as |
| :---: | :---: |
| pitron | mâtrô-s |
| pitr-bhis | mâtr-bhis |
| pitr-bhyas | mâtr-bhyas |
| pit $\mathrm{r}_{\text {R }}$-nâm | mât $\hat{r}-\mathrm{n}$ ám |
| pitr-shu | mâtr-shu |

mâtâ mâtar-am
mâtr-â
mâtr-ê
mâtur
mâtar-i
mâtar
mâtar-âu
mâtr-bhyâm
mâtr-ós
A. dâtr̂-n
I. dâtr-bhis
D. Ab. dâtr-bhyas
G. dâtî-nâm
L. dâtr-shu

Dual.

## Plural.

pitâ
pitar-am
pitr- $\hat{a}$
pitr-ê
pitur
pitar-i
pitar
pitar-âu
pitr-bhyâm
pitr-ôs

The locatives pitari and mâtari are treated as strong cases, while the corresponding Greek datives $\pi a \tau \rho i$ and $\mu \eta \tau \rho i$ have become weak.

Bopp considers that the term. of the abl. and gen. sing. -ur is for -urs, and that this is derived by metathesis from -rus, which represents an older -ras: pitr-as would be exactly $=$ Gr. $\pi$ aroós..$\quad$ This view is supported by Zend, in which we find dâthrô (gen. sing.), which has arisen from dâthras.
V. Labial.- $\hat{A} p$ (f. water), only used in the plural, forms its strong cases from $\hat{a} p$, and its weak from $a p$, which becomes $a d$ when followed by bh. Div (f. sky) forms its nom. and voc. sing. from dyô, its intermediate cases from $d y u$, and all the rest from div.
§. 114. The division of cases into strong and weak manifests itself remarkably in the accentuation of monosyllabic nouns, of which the strong cases retain the accent on the stem, while the weak have it on the case-ending. In this law of accentuation Greek in general agrees with Sanskrit, and it has consequently been inferred by Bopp that the division of the cases into the strong and the weak had already partially begun in Indo-European times. As far as the accentuation is concerned, the accusative plural ranks as a strong case: this fact points back to the time when the acc. pl. was in every respect strong, as it must have been in early times on account of its being older than all the other cases (except the vocative). In the Veda we also find traces of its having been strong, as in the acc. pl. pitáras ( $=$ Gr. $\pi a \tau$ épas $)$ for which in later Sanskrit we find pitịn. The declension of the Sanskrit stems nôu and $v \hat{a} k^{\prime}$, as compared with that of the Greek stems vav and òm, illustrates the agreement of Sanskrit and Greek in the accentuation of the cases:

Singular.

| N. V. | nâ'us | vaṽs | $v a^{\prime \prime} k$ | ${ }^{\circ} \psi$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | nâ่vam | $\nu \bar{\eta} a$ | $v \hat{a}^{\prime} k^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ő $\pi$ a |
| I. | $n \hat{a} v \hat{a}^{\prime}$ | - | vâk' ${ }^{\prime \prime}$ | - |
| D. | nâvê' | - | vâk'é | - |
| Ab. | nâvás | - | vâk'a's | - |
| G. | nâvás | väós | vâk'a's | ỏmós |
| L. (Gr. D.) |  | $\nu \bar{\alpha} \hat{i}$ | vâk't | obit |


| N. A. V. | nầvâu | $\nu$ ขa $\varepsilon$ | $v a^{\prime} k k^{\prime} \hat{a} u$ | $\pi \varepsilon$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { I. D. Ab. } \\ \text { (Gr.G.D.) } \end{array}\right\}$ | nâubhyâm | vaoir | vâgbhy | олоі |
| G. L. | nâvố | - | vâk' |  |


| N. V. | nâ'vas | $\nu$ vás | vák'k'as | öтє¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | $n \hat{\text { ávas }}$ | väas | $v \hat{a}^{\prime} k^{\prime}{ }^{\prime}{ }^{\text {a }}$ | őtas |
| I. | nâubhis | - | vâgbhis | - |
| D. Ab. | nâublyyás | - | vâgbhyás |  |
| G. | $n \hat{a} v \hat{a}^{\prime} m$ | vaŵv | vâk' ${ }^{\prime}$ 'm | $\dot{\partial} \pi \bar{\omega} \nu$ |
| L. (Gr. D.) | nâushú | vavoí | vâkshú | ò $\psi \mathfrak{i}$ |

In the declension of $\nu a \tilde{v} s$ given above I have used generally the Doric forms as being nearer to the Sanskrit, on account of their having kept the original $\bar{\alpha}$, except in the acc. sing., where the Ionic $\nu \tilde{\eta} a$ is nearer to nấvam than the Doric vaüv or $\nu \tilde{\nu} \nu$.

There are some exceptions to the foregoing law of accentuation in Sanskrit: e.g. gô (m. f. an ox, cow), s'van (m. a dog), kruñk' (m. a plover) always keep the accent on the stemsyllable. The same is the case with $r \hat{a} g^{\prime}$ (m. a king), k.rt (making), and roots in $\hat{a}$, such as $d h m \hat{a}$ (to blow), when occurring at the end of compounds, except in the vocative, where the accent is thrown as far back as possible, as in sán̈khadh-
mâs, voc. sing. of St. s'ä̈khadhmâ (m. a shell-blower). In the Greek stems $\beta_{o v}$ and $\kappa v \nu$, corresponding to Skr. gô and s'van, the accent, however, follows the general rule : thus we have кvví $=$ s'únê, кvvós $=s^{\prime} \dot{u} n a s$, кvvoì $\nu=s^{\prime} v a ́ b h y a ̂ m, ~ \kappa v \nu \tilde{\omega} \nu=s^{\prime} u ́ n a ̂ m$,
 ßovoi = gôshu. In div (f. heaven) the accent is kept on the stem in the intermediate cases, as in the instr. pl. dyúbhis ; in the intermediate cases of nar ( m . a man), the accent may fall either on the stem or on the case-ending, as in dat. pl. $n r^{\prime} b h y a s$ or nrbhyás. In the Greek $\dot{a} \nu \eta \dot{\rho}$, corresponding to Skr. nar, the accent is kept on the $\varepsilon$ whenever it appears as
 lost, the case ending is accented as in Sanskrit; thus we have Gr. ${ }^{2} \nu \delta \rho i=$ Skr. narí, \&c.

The following Sanskrit monosyllabic stems accentuate the case-ending of the accusative plural, like those of the other weak cases : $a p$ (f. water), dat (m. tooth), div (f. heaven), nas (f. nose), nis' (f. night), pad (m. foot), punis (m. man), mâs (m. month), path (m. path), math (m. churning-stick), râi (f. riches), and $\hat{u} h$ (for vâh at the end of compounds), suhrd ( $m$. friend), and other compounds of $h r d$ ( $n$. heart). The Greek presents an older form than the Sanskrit in módas = Skr. padás, while in the other cases the accentuation is the same, as in $\pi o \delta i=p a d i, \pi o \delta o ́ s=p a d a ́ s, \pi o \delta \tilde{\omega} \nu=p a d \hat{a} m, \pi o \sigma \sigma i$ $=$ patsú.

It has been already remarked that the opinion is maintained that the distinction between the strong and weak cases in monosyllabic stems had already begun in Indo-European times. Now, if such a distinction had then manifested itself, and if it had begun in a difference of accentuation, it would be quite natural to expect that the Greek stems $\beta \mathbf{~} \boldsymbol{v}$ and $\kappa v \nu$ should be accented in the same way as the Skr. stems gô and s'van, but this, as we have seen, is not the case; for in Sanskrit these stems are accented throughout their whole declension, whereas in the Greek corresponding stems the accent is placed
on the case-endings of the weak cases. It is then safer to suppose that, when the Greek and Sanskrit separated from each other, there was no distinction (as far as monosyllabic stems were concerned) between the accentuation of the strong and that of the weak cases, and consequently, as we shall see, only one form of the stem (i. e. the strong one) existed. It is, however, evident that certain latent tendencies already existed in Indo-European, which afterwards bore similar fruits in Sanskrit and Greek.

Before the first separation of any Indo-European language from the parent stock, the only law of accentuation that existed was this, that the root-syllable should always have the accent. Consequently in the declension of monosyllabic stems the accent always fell upon the stem, which preserved the strong form in every case. In process of time, but not till after the first separation that occurred in the Indo-European, the accent began to move towards the termination, and consequently, as generally happens to unaccented syllables, the stem became shortened in form. The initial consonants* ( $b h$ and $s$ ) of the intermediate case-endings preserved the accent on the stem in these cases for a longer period than it remained on the stem in the weak cases, and consequently these cases frequently preserve a stronger form of the stem than is found in the weak cases. The accentuation of the intermediate cases of div (e. g. instr. pl. dyúbhis, \&c.) is a relic of the

* Oxytone stems of the part. pres. active allow the accent to fall on the case-ending in the weak cases, while in the intermediate cases the accent is kept where it originally was, as the consonantal combinations $d b h$ and $t s$ prevent it passing over them : thus from St. tudánt (striking) we have instr. pl. tudádbhis, loc. pl. tudátsi beside instr. sing. tudatả', \&c. Similarly the consonantal conjunction $n t$ prevents the accent moving on to the final syllable in nom. and acc. dual neuter tudántt̂, whereas in the side form of the same cases tudati $i^{\prime}$ the accent advances. In participles such as bhárant (bearing) the accent remains on the root syllable throughout the whole declension.
time when the accent in these cases still remained on the stem ; while that of nr'bhyas or nrbhyás (dat. pl. of nar) points to the time when the accent in the same cases was moving on from the stem to the case-ending. The monosyllabic pronouns and the numeral two also retain the accent on the stem in Sanskrit in the weak cases: thus we have tếshu=Gr. roï $\quad$ 七 tâ'su = Gr. тaï $\sigma$, yếshu = Gr. oĩ $\sigma \iota$, máhyam = L. mihi, túbhyam $=$ L. tibi, máma (gen. sing. of ahám, I), dvâb bhyâm = Gr. סvoĩv, which latter has become weak beside the nom. ס́vo, which is still strong.


## Sanskrit Vocalic Stems.

§. 115. Stems ending in $a$ (m. and n.) and $\hat{a}$ (f.) are very numerous; e. g. s'iva [which as an adjective means prosperous, while as a noun S'iva (m.) is the god S'ivâ, s'ivâ (f.) his wife, and s'ivam (n.) happiness] is thus declined:

Singular.

| N. | Masc. <br> s'ivas | Fem. <br> $s^{\prime} i v \hat{a}$ | Neut. <br> s'ivam |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | s'ivam | s'ivâm | s'ivam |
| I. | s'ivêna | sivayâ | s'icêna |
| D. | s'irâya | s'ivâyâi | s'ivâya |
| Ab. | s'ivât | s'ivâyâs | s'ivât |
| G. | s'ivasya | s'ivâyâs | s'ivasya |
| L. | s'ivê | s'ivâyâm | sivê |
| V. | s'iva | s'ivê | s'iva |

Dual.

| N. A. V. | Masc. <br> s’ivâu | Fem. <br> s'ivê | Neut. <br> s'ivé |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I. D. Ab | s'ivâbhyâm | s'ivâbhyam | s'ivâbhyâm |
| G. L. | s'ivayôs | s'ivayôs | s'ivayôs |

Plural.

| N. V. | Masc. <br> s'ivâs | Fem. <br> s'ivâs | Neut. s'ivâni |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| A. | s'ivân | s'ivâs | s'ivâni |
| I. | s'ivâis | s'ivâbhis | s'ivâis |
| D. Ab. | s'ivêbhyas | s'ivâbhyas | s'ireêbhyas |
| G. | s'ivânâm | s'ivânâm | s'ivânâm |
| L. | s'ivêshu | s'ivâsu | s'ivêshu |

The declension of these stems corresponds to that of malus,


Stems ending in $\hat{a}$, both masculine and feminine, are derived from verbal roots ending in $\hat{a}$, as s'ä̈khadhmâ (m. f. a shell-blower), from s'an̈kha (a shell, Gr. кó $\chi \chi \eta$ ) and $d h m a \hat{a}$ (to blow). The strong and intermediate cases of this stem are formed from s'aükhadhmâ, and the weak from s'ä̈khadhm. The neuter stem is s'ä̈khadhma, which is declined as s'iva (n.).
§. 116. Stems in $i, \imath, u, \hat{u}$. We find masc. fem. and neut. stems in $i$ and $u$; e. g. kavi (m. poet), gati (f. motion), vâri ( n . water), \&c.; bhânu ( m . the sun), dhênu (f. a milch-cow), tâlu ( n . the palate), \&c. We find stems in $\hat{\imath}$ and $\hat{u}$, both masc. and fem., derived from verbal roots such as $k r \hat{\imath}$ (to buy), $l \hat{\imath}$ (to cut), \&c.; these stems are of course monosyllabic. We find other polysyllabic stems in $\hat{\imath}$ and $\hat{u}$, also masc., such as pap $\hat{\imath}$ (m. the sun), $n \underset{t}{ } t \hat{u}$ (m. a dancer), \&c. In general stems in $\hat{\imath}$ and $\hat{u}$ are feminine, such as $b h \hat{\imath}$ (f. fear), bh $\hat{u}$ (f. earth), radh $\hat{u}$ (f. a wife), \&c.
§. 117. The chief diphthongal stems are $r a \hat{i} i$ ( $\mathrm{m} . \mathrm{f}$. wealth, L. res), $g \hat{o}$ (m. an ox, f. a cow), $d y \hat{o}$ (f. heaven), nâu (f. a ship), glâu (m. the moon).*

[^83]
## GREEK CONSONANTAL STEMS.

## §. 118. Guttural Stems.

The nom. sing of these stems ends in $\xi$.
I. Stems ending in к: кою $\breve{\kappa}$ (m. а crow), $\delta \rho \breve{\kappa}$ (f. the hand, connected with $\delta \rho a ́ \sigma \sigma о \mu a \iota, ~ \delta \rho a \chi \mu$ й, $\delta \rho a ́ \gamma \mu a$, $\delta a ́ \rho к-\varepsilon \varsigma, ~ m e a n i n g ~$ bundles according to Hesychius), $\theta \omega \rho \bar{a} \kappa$ ( m . a corslet), $\beta \lambda \bar{a} \kappa$ (weak, connected with $\mu a \lambda \alpha \kappa o ́ s$ ), $\dot{a} \lambda \omega \pi \varepsilon \kappa$ (f.nom. sing. $\dot{a} \lambda \omega \bar{\omega} \pi \eta \xi$, where $\varepsilon$ irregularly becomes $\eta$; this word is perhaps derived from $\dot{a} \lambda \omega \pi$ ós which meant craft, Hesych.), $\sigma \phi \eta \kappa$ (m., derived from Curtius from the same root as L. vespa, by the addition of the individualizing suffix $\kappa$, which is found in $\mathfrak{i \xi \rho a} \xi$ beside iєро́s, $\mu \dot{v} \varrho \mu \eta \xi=\mu \dot{v} \rho \mu о \varsigma$, an ant, $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \omega ́ \pi \pi \eta \xi$ beside $\dot{a} \lambda \omega \pi o ́ s, \& c$; the stages through which the original vaspa passed were ac-

 nom. sing. фoivı $\xi$, where the $\iota$ is irregularly shortened as in $\kappa \tilde{\eta} \rho \nu \xi$ from St. кпрӣк), $\gamma v \nu a \iota *$ (f. nom. sin. $\gamma v \nu \eta$ и, voc. $\gamma v ́ v a \iota ;$ this noun is also declined as an $a$-stem, as acc. sing. $\gamma \boldsymbol{\nu \nu} \boldsymbol{\eta} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ acc. pl. $\gamma v v a ́ s, \& c.), \& c$. These $\kappa$-stems are very common in Greek, and are either root-stems such as $\pi \tau а ̆ \kappa$ (f. acc. sing. $\pi \tau$ áка, a hare, found in Æsch. Ag. 135) from R. $\pi \tau \breve{\alpha} \kappa$, whence $\dot{\xi}-\pi \tau \alpha \kappa 0 \nu, \pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \sigma=\pi \tau \eta \kappa-y \omega, \pi \tau \dot{\omega} \xi$, or stems of uncertain origin such as корйк, vє $\bar{\alpha} \kappa$ ( m . a young man), \&c. The $\kappa$ of these latter stems may however have arisen from an older $\kappa \boldsymbol{\kappa}=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k a$, a very common suffix; thus $\mu a \lambda a \kappa o ́ s$ became $\mu a \lambda \alpha \kappa s$, and then $\mu \lambda a \xi$, and finally $\beta \lambda a ́ \xi$, as ßоотós from $\mu \rho о т о$. Many $\kappa$-stems exist side by side with ones in ко or $\kappa \eta$ : thus oik in

* 「uvatx is accented in the oblique cases like monosyllabic stems, such as $\dot{\delta} \pi$, see $\S .114$; thus as the strong cases we have $\gamma v v a i ̃ \kappa a, ~ \gamma v \nu a i ̃ \kappa$,
 $\gamma v \nu a u k$ may either be for $\gamma v \nu a k \iota=\mathrm{I}$. E. ganak̂ , the fem. of ganaka, whence Skr. g'anaka (a father); and as the accent generally is placed on the fem. termination - $\hat{\imath}$, it may be kept here on it, although transposed, or else it may be derived from $\gamma^{v \nu a}+$ R. 七к (to be like), and declined as a rootstem. This latter derivation is improbable, as the R. $\iota x$ was originally $F_{\iota} \kappa$.
 ī̄ка for iшкй from iшкй, коо́к-а for кро́кทь from кро́ки, 入а́к-ає
 in the dialects we find a similar connexion between the $\kappa$-and the кo-stems: thus we have Ion. фú入aкo-я= $=\dot{\prime} \lambda a \xi$, Ion.
 $\kappa 0-\varsigma=a \tilde{\lambda} \lambda \alpha \xi$.
II. Stems ending in $\gamma: \dot{\alpha} \rho \pi a ̆ \gamma, \dot{\rho} \bar{a} \gamma$ (f. a berry), $\mu a \sigma \tau i \bar{\gamma}$ (f. a whip; Homer uses $\mu a \sigma \tau \iota$ as the stem whence dat. $\mu a ́ \sigma \tau \iota$, acc. $\mu$ á $\sigma \tau \iota \nu$ ), $\phi \lambda o \gamma$ (f. from R. $\phi \lambda \varepsilon \gamma=$ Skr. blı $\hat{a} g^{\prime}$, to shine), $\delta_{\iota} \zeta_{\nu} \gamma$ (m. f. having two yokes), $\Sigma \phi \iota \gamma \gamma$ (f. the Sphinx, lit. the strangler : this stem becomes $\Phi_{\iota}$ in Bœotic, nom. sing. $\Phi_{i}(\xi)$,
 he-goat, from R. $a g=$ Skr. $a g^{\prime}$, to move, when Gr. ${ }^{\prime} \gamma-\omega$, L. ago), \&c. \&c.* There appears to be some connexion between the $\gamma$-stems and those in $-\gamma_{0}$ and $-\gamma \eta$, but not so close as the connexion between the $\kappa$-stems and those in -ко and -к $\boldsymbol{\eta}$; thus we find $\phi v \gamma$ in $\phi \dot{v} \gamma-a-\delta \varepsilon$ beside $\phi v \gamma \dot{\eta}, \quad \ddot{ } \varrho \pi a \xi$ (f. $=\dot{a} \rho \pi a \gamma \dot{\eta}$ in


III. Stems ending in $\chi: \beta_{\eta \chi}$ (f. a cough), roı $\chi$ (f. nom. sing. $\theta \rho i \xi$ ), ó $\rho \nu \iota \chi$ ( m . f. Doric for ó $\rho \nu \iota \theta$, beside which in Pindar we find stem ó $\rho v \iota$ ), $\sigma \pi \iota \chi$ (f. a row), $\pi \tau v \chi$ (f. a fold), ỏvu (m. a nail), \&c. $\dagger$ There appears also to be some connexion between these stems and those in - $\chi 0$ and $-\chi \eta$; thus we have $\pi \tau \dot{\prime} \xi$ beside $\pi \tau v \chi \dot{\eta}, \sigma \tau i \xi$ beside $\sigma \tau i \neq o-s, \dot{a} \gamma \chi \circ \tilde{v}$ (the gen. of an old $\chi^{0 \text {-stem }) ~ b e s i d e ~}{ }^{\prime} \gamma \chi^{-\iota}$ (the loc. of an old $\chi$-stem) ; $\dot{v \nu v \chi}$ is probably derived from an older obv$\nu \boldsymbol{o}=\mathrm{I}$. E. nagha, whence Skr. nakha-s (m. a nail), L. ungui-s, Lith. naga-s (id.).
* $\Pi \dot{\xi} \xi$ (with the fists) may be a shortened dat. pl. from a stem $\pi v \gamma$, connected with $\pi v \gamma^{-\dot{\omega} \nu}$ (an ell), $\pi v \gamma-\mu \dot{\eta}$ (the fist), L. pug-nus, pug-il, \&c: Consult Curtius, Grundzüge, \&c., p. 258.
$\dagger \Pi \lambda i \xi(f . \beta \tilde{\eta} \mu \alpha)$, appears to be from the stem $\pi \lambda \iota \chi$; compare $\pi \lambda \iota \chi-\alpha \dot{\varsigma}$ (interfeminium). "A $\gamma \chi-\iota$ may be the loc. of an old stem $a \gamma \chi$, connected with $\dot{a} \gamma \chi \omega, \stackrel{a}{a} \chi \circ \varsigma, \mathrm{~L}$. angustus, anxius, \&c.


## §. 119. Dental Stems.

I. Stems ending in $\tau$ : $\boldsymbol{\gamma}^{\boldsymbol{a} \lambda a \kappa \tau}$ (n. nom. sing $\gamma$ á $\lambda a$ ), vuкт (f. nom. sing. $\nu^{\prime} \xi$ ), $\mu \varepsilon \lambda_{\iota \tau}$ (n. nom. sing. $\mu_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \lambda_{\iota}$ ), $\tau \varepsilon \rho a \tau$ (n. nom. sing. тध́ $\rho a \varsigma$ ), $\delta a \iota \tau$ (f. nom. sing. $\delta a i \varsigma$ ), кє $\rho \overline{\sigma^{\prime}} \tau^{*}$ (n. horn, nom.
 meat, nom. sing. ко́́as), $\chi \rho \omega \tau$ (m. nom. sing. $\chi \rho \omega \dot{\rho}$ ), घ̇ $\rho \omega \tau$ (m.), रapır† (f. nom. sing. रápıs), ỏveıpat (n. found in gen.
 m . a dream), $\pi \rho \sigma \sigma \omega \pi a \tau$ ( n . found in dat. pl. $\pi \rho \circ \sigma \dot{\omega} \pi a-\sigma \iota$ beside $\pi \rho o ́ \sigma \omega \pi \sigma^{-\nu}, \mathrm{n}$.), $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\nu} \mathrm{F} a \tau$ ( n . the knee, nom. sing. रóvv, gen. sing. үoúvaros and रóvatos = үovFatos, \&c. : $\gamma$ óvv is also declined as an $v$-stem, from which the former stem yovFar has been derived by means of the individualizing suffix $a \tau$, thus, gen. sing. $\gamma$ ov́vos $=\gamma$ ovvos, acc. pl. $\gamma$ ойva $=\gamma$ ovva ), סopFat (n. a spear, nom. sing. סópv, gen. sing. סov́ןatos and סópatos $=\delta$ opFaros, \&c., $\delta o ́ \rho v$ is also declined as an $v$-stem, thus gen. sing. סovoós $=$ Sopvos, \&c., and as a $\rho$-stem, thus gen. sing. סoo-ós, dat. sing. $\delta o \rho$ - $i$, and perhaps as a $\sigma$-stem, thus dat. sing. $\delta o ́ \rho \varepsilon \iota=\delta 0 \rho \varepsilon \sigma-\iota$, acc. pl. $\delta_{0} \rho \eta=\delta о \rho \varepsilon a=\delta о \rho \varepsilon \sigma-a$ ), $\dot{\omega} \tau$ ( n . the ear, Ion. ovar, nom. sing. oũs, $\ddagger$ Ion. oṽac, gen. sing. $\omega_{\tau}$-ós, Ion. ov̌ar-os: Curtius supposes that the ori-

* The stems кє $\rho \bar{\alpha} \tau, \kappa \rho \varepsilon \alpha \tau, \chi \rho \omega \tau, i \delta \rho \omega \tau, \gamma^{\varepsilon \lambda \omega \tau}, \& c .$, appear to have side
 (dat. sing.) $=\kappa \varepsilon \rho a i ̈=\kappa \varepsilon \rho \alpha \sigma-\iota, \chi \rho \circ \frac{\imath}{\imath}$ (dat. sing. of $\chi \rho \omega_{\varsigma}$ ) $=\chi \rho \circ \sigma-t, \gamma^{\dot{\varepsilon} \lambda \omega}$ (acc. sing. of $\left.\gamma^{\prime} \lambda \omega \varsigma\right)=\gamma^{\varepsilon} \lambda o \alpha=\gamma^{\varepsilon} \lambda \rho \sigma-\alpha$, \&c. Beside $\varepsilon \rho \omega \tau$ we find the stem $\varepsilon \rho o$, whence comes acc. sing. $\hat{\varepsilon} \rho o \nu$.
$\dagger$ Beside such stems as $\chi^{\alpha \rho \iota \tau}$ and other dental stems ending in $-\iota \delta,-i \theta$, $-v \delta,-v \theta$, which are not oxytone in the nom. sing., other stems are found
 $\mathrm{o}_{\varsigma}=\theta_{\dot{\delta} \tau t-o \varsigma,}^{\prime} \& \mathrm{c} .:$ in the case of oxytone stems no such side forms exist, and we only find such forms as $i \lambda \pi i \delta-\alpha, \chi^{\lambda} \alpha \mu v i \delta-\alpha, \lambda a \mu \pi \alpha \dot{\delta}-\alpha, \& c$.
$\ddagger 0 \bar{v} \varsigma$ may be connected with Skr. av (to desire), Gr. $\dot{\alpha}-\frac{i}{i} \omega$ (I hear), $\tilde{a}^{-}$ ${ }_{\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon}(\dot{\alpha} \kappa 0 v \dot{\varepsilon} \tau \varepsilon$, Hesych.), L. av-eo, au-dio, \&c. The suffix $\alpha \tau$ appears also in stem $\dot{\alpha} \lambda a \tau$ (salt), whence dat. pl. $\dot{\alpha} \lambda \alpha \sigma \iota \nu$.
ginal form of $\dot{\omega} \tau$ was $a \dot{v} \sigma-a \tau, a \tau$ being the same suffix that appears in $\delta o \rho v-a \tau$ and $\gamma o v v-a \tau$, and he connects with it L. auris for aus-is, cf. aus-culto, Goth. aus-o, the ear, Lith. aus-is, id.) ; $\delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu a \tau^{*}(\mathrm{n}$. bonds, nom. pl. $\delta \varepsilon \varepsilon \sigma \mu a \tau-a$ beside $\delta \varepsilon \sigma \mu \circ \varsigma, \mathrm{m}$.), $\sigma \omega \mu a \tau$ (n. nom. sing. $\sigma \bar{\omega} \mu a$ ), ò $\mu \mu a \tau$ (n. for or- $\mu a \tau$, Жоl. о̇ттат, nom. sing. ©’ $\mu \mu a$ ), घí $\mu a \tau$ (n. for $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \sigma-\mu a \tau$, Æol. द̇ $\mu \mu a \tau$, nom. sing. є $\check{\mu} \mu$ ), \&c.; participial stems in $-a \nu \tau,-\varepsilon \nu \tau,-o \nu \tau,-v \nu \tau$, such as $\beta_{\iota} \beta a \nu \tau, \beta a \nu \tau, \tau v \psi a \nu \tau, \tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \nu \tau, \theta_{\varepsilon \nu \tau}, \beta \lambda_{\eta} \theta \varepsilon \nu \tau$, тvттоעt, $\delta_{\iota}$ $\delta_{o \nu \tau}, \delta \varepsilon ⿺ 𠃊 \nu \nu \nu \tau, \& c . ;$ stems, which perhaps were originally participles, such as $\mathrm{F}_{\text {skovt }}$ (willing, from R. $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{\varepsilon} \kappa}=$ Skr. vas', to wish), $\theta \varepsilon \rho a \pi o \nu \tau, \lambda_{\varepsilon о \nu \tau},{ }^{\prime} A \tau \lambda a \nu \tau$ (lit. the bearer, from R. $\tau a \lambda$ $=$ Skr. tul, to bear, cf. $\tau \lambda \tilde{\eta}-\nu a \iota, \tau a ́ \lambda a-s, \& c$.), $\lambda \nu \kappa \alpha \beta a \nu \tau$ (the year, lit. the course of light), ódovt (lit. the eater, from R. ह̇o, to eat, nom. sing. ó onoús, cf. סıסoúc, nom. sing. of participial stem $\delta \iota \delta o \nu \tau$ ), \&c.; $\phi \omega \tau$ (m. a man, nom. sing $\phi \dot{\omega} \varsigma$ ) may be an old participle of R. $\phi v$ (to produce), and $=\phi \circ \mathrm{Fa} \mathrm{\tau}$ (lit. the producer), cf. Skr. bhavat (being) from R. bĥ̂ (to be); par-
 $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\text {икот (nom. sing. }} \lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\nu \kappa \omega} \varsigma$ ), \&c. ; stems in $-\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon \nu \tau}$ (nom. sing. m. $-\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon ı \varsigma, ~}$ n. $-\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon \nu}, \mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{r}}-\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon} \sigma \sigma a=-\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon \tau y}$ a from the weak form of the stem $-\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon r}=$ Skr. $-v a n t \dagger$ (full of, provided with), such as
* Stems in $-\mu a r$ are very common, and have arisen perhaps from older forms in $-\mu a \nu r$, traces of which are found in the cognate adjectival and other stems in $-\mu o \nu$, and in verbs ending in $-\mu u \iota \nu \omega$; thus we have $\boldsymbol{\varepsilon} \dot{v}-$
 beside $\chi$ sip $\omega \nu$ and $\chi \varepsilon \mu a i \nu \omega$ (compare Skr. hêman, m. winter, and hêmanta, m . and n . id.). That verbs in -at $\omega \omega$ originally possessed $\tau$ appears not impossible if we compare $\ddot{v} \phi \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$ and $\mu i \alpha \sigma \mu \alpha$, which arose from $\dot{v} \phi a \tau \mu a$ and $\mu \mu a \tau \mu a$, with $\dot{v} \phi a i \nu \omega$ and $\mu \iota a i \nu \omega$. This connexion of $-\mu a \tau$ with $-\mu a \nu \tau$ is supported by comparing byouar with L. cognomen and cognomentum, tegumen with tegumentum, \&c.
$\dagger$ Пavt (nom. $\pi \tilde{a} \varsigma, \pi \tilde{a} \sigma a, \pi \tilde{a} \nu)$ appears to contain this suffix, and to point back to an I. E. kvâ-vant or kvâ-vunta, whence L. quantu-s, U. panta. Kvâvan meant " how much," just as Skr. târant meant "so much" (cf. L. tantus) and yâvant. " how much." חãoa (Æol. пaĩoa) arose from $\pi a \nu \tau y a$ through the steps $\pi \alpha \nu \tau-z a, \pi a \nu \tau-\sigma \alpha, \pi a \nu-\sigma a: a$ in $\pi \tilde{a} \nu$ is irregularly lengthened; it is short in $\dot{a} \pi \check{a} \nu$.
 (the nom. sing. of which ends generally in -a - , and sometimes in $-\omega \rho$, whereas the oblique cases reject $\rho^{*}$, and are formed from stems in $-a \tau$, except $\delta a ́ \mu a \rho, f$, the oblique cases of which are $\delta \dot{\mu} \mu a \rho \tau-o s, \delta a ́ \mu a \rho \tau-\iota, \& c$., compare $\delta o ́ \mu о \rho \tau \iota-\varsigma=\delta a ́-$ $\mu a \rho$, Hesych.), such as $\phi \rho \varepsilon \bar{a} \tau$ for $\phi \rho \varepsilon a \rho \tau$ (n. a well, gen. sing.
 $\dot{\eta} \pi a \tau$ for $\dot{\eta} \pi a \rho \tau=$ Skr. yakrt (n. the liver), $\sigma \kappa a \rho \tau$ (n. dung, nom. sing. $\sigma \kappa(\omega \rho \rho)=$ Skr. s'akrt (n. id.), $\sigma \tau \varepsilon a \tau$ for $\sigma \tau \varepsilon a \rho \tau$ (n. fat,

 $-\tau \eta \tau \dagger$, all feminine, such as $\phi \iota \lambda o \tau \eta \tau$ (love, nom. sing. $\phi \iota \lambda$ ó $^{-}$ $\tau \eta \zeta), \& c$.
II. Stems ending in $-\delta$ (which is lost in nom. sing.) $\ddagger$ : $\lambda a \mu-$

 beside $\Theta \varepsilon \tau \iota$ ), $\grave{\varepsilon} \lambda \pi \iota \delta\left(f_{0}\right)$, $\mathfrak{a} i ̈ \delta(m$. only used in the oblique cases) ; $\pi o \delta$ (m. nom. sing. $\pi$ oús, the compounds of which can also form their acc. sing. like stems in ov, e. g. Oidímoda
 (f. a doll) ; фчঠ (f. a blister) ; таıঠ (m. f.) ; к $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \delta$ (f. acc. sing. $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon i \nu$ and $\kappa \lambda_{\varepsilon i \delta}{ }^{2}$, acc. pl. $\kappa \lambda_{\varepsilon i \varsigma}$ and $\left.\kappa \lambda \varepsilon i \delta a \varsigma\right), \& c$.
* We find other instances of the omission of $r$; thus $\pi$ ori $=$ Kret.
 whence $\phi \rho \dot{\rho} \sigma \sigma \omega=\phi \rho a y y \omega$, L. pedo $=$ Gr. $\pi \hat{\varepsilon} \rho \delta \omega$, E. speak $=$ G. sprechen, \&c.
$\dagger$ This stem-termination arose from an I. E. -tâti, which is found in Skr. sivatâti (f. benevolence), sarvatati $=\mathrm{Gr}$. $\dot{\text { onor }} \boldsymbol{\eta}$, \&c., and in the Latin plural genitives, civitati-um, atati-um, voluptati-um, \&c.
$\ddagger$ In Æolic $\bar{\delta}$ is also lost in acc. sing. : thus we find in this dialect such
 $\kappa \lambda \eta i \bar{o} a, \pi a i ̂ ̀ a, \chi^{\lambda} \dot{\mu} \mu v \delta a$.
§ Beside $\kappa \lambda \in i$ ' we find the Doric form $\kappa \lambda \grave{a} \xi$, which Ahrens (" De Dialecto Dorica," pp. 94, 140, 141), considers to have arisen from $\kappa \lambda$ ais, ts being changed into $\xi$. This explanation is very doubtful, and it is much more likely that the final guttural in $\kappa \lambda \alpha^{\xi} \xi$ arose from the dental in $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon \iota \delta$. If this

IlI. Stems ending in $-\boldsymbol{\theta}$ (which is lost in nom. sing.): $\Pi a \rho \nu \eta \theta$ ( m . a mountain in Attica) ; ò $\rho \nu \imath ̈ \theta$ ( m . f. beside ógvı
 (f. a worm, beside $£ \lambda \mu \iota$ and $\varepsilon \lambda \mu \iota \gamma \gamma$ ), $\pi \varepsilon \iota \rho \iota \nu \theta$ (f. a wicker basket); T $\iota \rho \nu \nu$ (f.) ; \&c.
IV. Stems ending in -s (preceded by any vowel).

 from a stem кขєфєs), $\beta_{\rho \varepsilon \tau a c}$ ( n . an image), $\kappa \omega a s$ ( n . a fleece), ovidas (n. the ground), үךৎas (n.), $\delta \varepsilon \pi a \varsigma ~(n),. ~ \& c . ~ T h e s e ~$ stems appear to be closely connected with others in - $\varepsilon s$ : thus
 $\kappa \omega \varepsilon \varsigma$, ov $\delta \varepsilon \varepsilon, \& c$. It has been suggested that stems in -as have arisen from older forms in $-a \tau$, and accordingly they have been compared with such stems as $\kappa \varepsilon \rho a \tau$ ( n . a horn, whence nom. sing. кє́ $\rho a \varsigma$, gen. sing. кє́ $\rho \bar{a} \tau-о \varsigma$ and ќ́ $\rho \omega \varsigma=\kappa \varepsilon \rho a \circ \varsigma, \tau$ being thrown out), крєat (n. flesh, for $\kappa \rho \varepsilon F y a \tau$, whence nom.

$2^{\circ}$. Stems in - $\varepsilon \varsigma$ : adjectival stems in $-\varepsilon \varsigma$ such as $\sigma a \phi \varepsilon \varsigma$, \&c., of which the nom. sing. masc. and fem. ends in $-\eta s$; substantival masc. stems in $-\varepsilon \mathrm{s}$, of which the nom. sing. also ends in $-\eta \varsigma$, as $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a \tau \varepsilon \varsigma$, 'A $\quad \varepsilon \varepsilon$, \&c., while the acc. sing. may either come from these stems ( $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau \eta=\Sigma \omega \kappa \varrho a \tau \varepsilon \sigma-a$ ), or from stems in $-\boldsymbol{a}$ ( $\Sigma \omega \kappa \rho a ́ \tau \eta \nu$ ); substantival neuter stems in $-\varepsilon \varsigma$, which becomes -os in the nom. sing.; e. g. $\gamma \in \nu \varepsilon \varsigma$, nom. sing.
 from St. genes, \&c. These latter stems have frequently side forms ending in -o: thus we have $\sigma \kappa \sigma \tau \varepsilon$ ( n. ) and $\sigma \kappa о \tau о$ (m.), ó $\chi \varepsilon s$ (n.) and ó $\chi$ o (m.), $\kappa \lambda a \delta s \varsigma$ (found in dat. pl. $\kappa \lambda \alpha ́ \delta \varepsilon \sigma \iota$ ) beside $\kappa \lambda a \delta o(\mathrm{~m}),. \delta \varepsilon \nu \delta \rho \varepsilon s$ (n.) beside $\delta \varepsilon \nu \delta \rho \circ$ (n.), áv $\nu \rho a \pi o \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$
be so, $\kappa \lambda \dot{\alpha} \xi$ bears nearly the same relation or $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon i_{\zeta}$ (for $\kappa \lambda \varepsilon \iota \delta \varsigma$ ), that Dor. $\delta \rho \nu i \chi$ does to $\delta \rho \nu \boldsymbol{\imath} \theta$. $\theta$ and $\chi$ appear to be interchanged in Mod. Gr. $\Lambda \iota \theta \alpha \delta o ́-\nu \eta \sigma \alpha$ from $\Lambda \iota \chi a ́ \delta \varepsilon s$ and Mod. Gr. $\eta \rho \rho \chi \alpha$ from $\eta_{\eta} \lambda \theta o \nu$. Compare also
 $\psi \eta \phi i{ }^{2}$.
(found in dat. pl. àvסןamóסєб⿱九) beside ảvסрamoסo (n.), and many others.
$3^{\circ}$. Stems in -os: aidos (f. nom. sing. aio $\omega \mathrm{s}$, gen. sing.
 $=\eta \chi \circ \sigma-\circ \varsigma$ ), ท̉os (f. nom. sing. ท̉ $\omega \varsigma$ ), $\chi \rho \circ \varsigma$ (m. nom. sing. $\chi \varrho \omega \dot{\rho}$, gen. sing. $\chi \varrho$ оós $=\chi \rho \circ \sigma-$ os, beside Attic stem $\chi \rho \omega \tau), \pi \varepsilon \iota \theta$ os (f. nom. sing. $\pi \varepsilon \iota \theta \dot{\omega}$, gen. sing. $\pi \varepsilon \iota \theta o \bar{u} \varsigma$ ), \&c. The vocative
 and various theories have been proposed to account for these forms. One writer suggests that the original form of these stems ended in -ovi; another that they ended in $-o \nu$, and that $\nu$.was merely vocalized into $\iota$, as in Æol. $\mu_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\text {aus }}$ for $\mu \varepsilon \lambda a \nu \varsigma$, \&c., $\tau i \theta \varepsilon \iota s$ for $\tau \iota \theta \varepsilon \nu \varsigma$, \&c.; another that they ended in -ovı; another that they ended in $-\mathbf{o}$; another that they ended in -oו, inasmuch as we find such nominative forms as $\Lambda \eta \tau \psi$, $\Sigma a \pi \phi \varphi^{\prime}, \& c .$, and, lastly, another that $\sigma$ is vocalized into $\iota$. Whatever may be the true explanation of this vocative in -ot, it apparently bears a remarkable resemblance to the Sanskrit vocative in ê of feminine nouns in - $\hat{a}$, e. g. s'ivê from s'ivâ ; for $\omega$ : $\hat{a}$ : : oc: $\hat{e}(a i)$.
$4^{\circ}$. Stems in $-v_{S}: \mu \bar{v} \varsigma$ (m. nom. sing. $\mu \tilde{v} \varsigma$, gen sing. $\mu \nu o ́ s$ $=\mu v \sigma-o \varsigma)$.
$5^{\circ}$. Stems in $-\omega \mathrm{s}: \quad \theta \omega \mathrm{s}$ (m. a jackal, nom. sing. $\theta \omega_{\mathrm{s}}$, gen.
 avunculus), $\dot{a} \lambda \omega_{s}$ (f. the threshing-floor, found in acc. sing. $\dot{a} \lambda \omega \alpha=\dot{a} \lambda \omega \sigma-a$, Arat. 940), кa $\lambda \omega \overline{\text { ( }} \mathrm{m}$. a rope), \&c. Some of these stems have side forms in $-\omega \nu$, and most of them can also be declined according to the Attic second declension.
V. Stems ending in $-\nu$ (preceded by any vowel).
$1^{\circ}$. Stems in $-a \nu$ : $\tau a \lambda \breve{a} \nu$ (nom. sing. m. $\tau a ́ \lambda a \varsigma ̧, ~ f . ~ \tau a ́ \lambda a \iota v a=~$ $\tau \alpha \lambda a \nu y a, ~ n . \tau a ́ \lambda \alpha \nu$ ), and similarly $\mu \varepsilon \lambda \breve{a} \nu$, the only other adjectival stem in $=\alpha \nu ; ~ \Pi \bar{a} \nu$ ( m . Pan, nom. sing. $\Pi a ́ \nu$ ), $\pi a \iota \bar{a} \nu$ ( m . nom. sing. $\pi a<a ́ v)$.
$2^{\circ}$. Stems in $-\varepsilon \nu$ : adjectival stems in $-\varepsilon \nu$, such as $\dot{\mu} \rho \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ (nom. sing. m. and f. ä $\rho \sigma \eta \nu$, n. ä $\rho \sigma \varepsilon \nu$ ), $\tau \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \nu$ (nom. sing. m.
$\tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \eta \nu$, f. $\tau \varepsilon \in \varepsilon \iota \nu a$, n. $\tau \varepsilon ́ \rho \varepsilon \nu$ ) ; $\phi \varrho \varepsilon \nu$ (f. nom. sing. $\phi \varrho \bar{\eta} \nu$ ) ; $\pi о \iota \mu \varepsilon \nu$ (m. nom. sing. $\pi о \iota \mu \boldsymbol{\eta} \nu)$; $\kappa \tau \varepsilon \nu$ (m. a comb, nom. sing. $\kappa \tau \varepsilon i ́ ¢$ ), غv (nom. sing. m. हǐc, n. हैv) ; \&c.
$3^{\circ}$. Stems in $-\eta \nu$ (nom. sing. $-\eta \nu$ ) : $\mu \eta \nu$ (m. beside Ion. $\mu \varepsilon i^{\prime}$, $=\mu \varepsilon \nu+\boldsymbol{s}$; Curtius considers that the original form of this stem was $\mu \eta \nu \varsigma$, whence comes Æolic $\mu \bar{\eta} \nu \nu o s$ for $\mu \eta \nu \sigma o s$, cf. L. mens-i-s), $\chi \eta \nu$ ( m . beside $\chi \eta \nu$ o found in $\chi \eta \nu o-\beta$ обкós; Curtius considers that this stem was originally $\chi^{\varepsilon \nu \mathrm{c}}$, or a fem. stem $\chi^{£ \nu \sigma \iota}$ beside Skr. hainsî = I. E. ghansî, Ch. Sl. gainsť), Z $\eta \nu$ (m. Jove), ${ }^{'} E \lambda \lambda_{\eta \nu}$ (m.), $\pi \varepsilon v \theta \eta \nu$ (m. an inquirer), $\pi v \rho \eta \nu$ (m. a fruit-stone), $\psi \eta \nu$ (m. the gall-insect), \&c.
$4^{\circ}$. Stems in-ıv: $\operatorname{\rho iv}$ (f. the nose, nom. sing. pós, and later $\rho^{\circ} \iota \nu$ ), $\theta_{\iota}^{-} \nu$ (m. f. a heap, nom. sing. $\theta_{i} \mathrm{~s}$, and later $\theta_{i} \nu$ ), iкriv and $\kappa \tau \bar{\imath} \nu$ (m. a weasel), $\delta \varepsilon \lambda \phi \bar{i} \nu$ (m.), \&c.
$5^{\circ}$. Stems in oov: $\chi \theta$ ov (f. perhaps for an older $\chi \theta$ o $\mu$, com-
 $z e m-l j a$, land) ; adjectival stems in -ov (nom. sing. m. f. $-\omega \nu$, n. $-o v$ ), such as $\mu \varepsilon \iota_{\mathrm{L}}^{\mathrm{o}} \mathrm{v}$ and other comparatives, in which $\nu$ may be thrown out, and the vowels contracted as in $\mu$ кíhous for and beside $\mu \varepsilon i \zeta \boldsymbol{\zeta} \boldsymbol{\nu} \varepsilon \varsigma$, while other adjectival stems in -ov, as $\sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \nu$, suं $\delta a \iota \mu \circ \nu$, cannot throw out $\nu ; \delta a \iota \mu \circ \nu(\mathrm{~m}),. \dot{\eta} \gamma \varepsilon \mu \circ \nu$


 єiкóvos and єiкoüs), Гoo gen. sing. Гopүóvos and Гọүóos, Dor. Гooүш̄s, Æol. Гó $\gamma \omega \varsigma)$, \&c. These feminine stems in -ov partly agree in their declension with feminine stems in oos: e. g. $\pi \varepsilon ⿺ \theta_{0}$ oús (gen. sing. of St. $\pi \varepsilon \notin \theta_{\mathrm{os}}$ ) is similar to $\varepsilon i \kappa o \tilde{v}_{S}$ (gen. sing. of St. $\varepsilon i-$ коv). This similarity is, however, not a sufficient basis on which to build the theory that all these stems in ov and -os,

$6^{\circ}$. Stems in $-v \nu: \mu o \sigma \sigma \bar{v} \nu$ (m. a tower, nom. sing. $\mu o ́ \sigma \sigma v \nu$ ),

oblique cases of $\kappa \dot{v} \omega \nu$ (m. f.), with the exception of the vocative кúov, are formed from St. кŭע.
$7^{\circ}$. Stems in $-\omega \nu$ : 'А $\pi o \lambda \lambda \omega \nu$, Побєь $\delta \omega \nu, \kappa \lambda \omega \nu$ (m. a branch, nom. sing. $\kappa \lambda \dot{\omega} \nu$ ), ai $\omega \nu$ (m.), $\dot{\eta} \rho \omega \nu$ (m. found in Syracusan $\dot{\eta} \rho \omega \dot{\varphi} \nu \varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota,{ }^{*}$ beside St. $\dot{\eta} \rho \omega \varsigma$ ), $\tau \alpha \dot{\omega} \nu$ (m. a peacock, nom. sing. $\tau a \dot{\omega} \dot{s}$, which is generally declined according to the Attic second declension), $\dot{a} \lambda \omega \nu$ (f. nom. sing. ä $\lambda \omega \boldsymbol{s}$, also declined according to Attic second declension), $\tau \nu \phi \omega \nu$ (m. nom. sing. $\tau v \phi \omega ́ \nu$ and $\tau v \phi \dot{\varphi}$ ), \&c.
$8^{\circ}$. Stems in $\nu$ preceded by a consonant: $\dot{a} \rho \nu$ (m. f. a lamb, without nom.), Пvкv (f. the Pnyx, nom. sing. Пvv́ ).
VI. Stems ending in $-\rho$ (preceded by any vowel).
$1^{\circ}$. Stems in -aן (nom. sing. -aן): $\nu \varepsilon \kappa \tau a \rho$ (n.), $\psi a \rho$ (m. the starling), цакај (m. happy, nom. sing. $\mu a ́ к а \rho, ~ Æ o l . ~ \mu a ́ к а \rho \varsigma), ~$ óap (f. a wife, from ó = Skr. $s a$, with, and a root $\sigma \alpha \rho$, to join, whence $\sigma \varepsilon \iota \rho a ́$, a rope ; or from ${ }_{\circ}=$ Skr. sa and Fa $=$ L. vir ; in the former case $\dot{v} a \rho$ would be for $\dot{o} \sigma a \rho$, and in the latter for $\dot{o} F a \rho$ ).
$2^{\circ}$. Stems ending in $\varepsilon \rho: \chi \varepsilon \rho$ (f. nom. sing. $\chi \varepsilon \notin \rho$, Жol. $\chi^{\xi} \rho \rho$,
 (m.), \&c.
$3^{\circ}$. Stems in $-\eta \rho$ : $\theta \eta \eta_{;}$(m. a wild beast), крат $\rho_{\rho}$ (m.), \&c.
 nom. sing. $\tilde{\eta} r o \rho$, the heart), $\dot{\alpha}$ o $\rho$ ( n. a sword), \&c.
$5^{\circ}$. Stems in $v \rho: \pi \breve{v} \rho$ (n. nom. sing. $\pi \tilde{v} \rho$ ), $\mu a \rho \pi \breve{\nu} \rho$ (m. nom. sing. $\mu a ́ \rho \tau v \varsigma$, and later $\mu a ́ \rho \tau v \rho), \Lambda \iota \gamma \breve{v} \rho(\mathrm{~m}),. ~ K \varepsilon \rho \kappa \bar{v} \rho(\mathrm{~m}).$.
$6^{\circ}$. Stems ending in $-\omega \rho: \phi \omega \rho$ (m. a thief), $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \omega \rho$ (n.), ${ }^{\prime} \chi \omega \rho(\mathrm{m}$.$) , \&c.$
VII. The only Greek stem in $-\lambda$ is $\dot{\alpha} \lambda$ (m. salt, f. the sea, nom. sing. ä $\lambda_{\text {s }}$ ).
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## §. 120. Labial Stems.

I. Stems ending in $-\pi$ : $\lambda a i \lambda \breve{a} \pi$ (f. a storm, nom. sing. $\lambda$ ai-
 $\dot{\rho} \iota \pi$ ( m . nom. sing. $\rho_{i}^{\prime} \psi$, a mat), киіт (m. an ant); òт (f.), 'Аıөıот (m.), кадаขюот (f. a shepherd's crook); $\gamma \overline{\mathrm{v} \pi}$ (m. a vulture) ; $\omega \pi$ (m. f.), \&c.
II. Stems ending in $-\beta$ : ' $A \rho \breve{a} \beta$ (m.), $\lambda \breve{\imath} \beta$ (m. a drop, from same root as $\lambda \varepsilon i(\beta \omega), \Lambda \breve{\imath} \beta$ (m. the south-west wind, lit. the moist wind, connected with last stem), $\chi £ \rho \nu \imath$ (f.), $\chi^{\alpha \lambda \nu} \beta$ (m. steel).
III. Stems ending in $-\phi$ : vı (f. snow, found only in oblique cases), $\kappa a \tau \eta \lambda_{\iota} \phi(f$. an upper story, nom. sing. $\kappa a \tau \tilde{n} \lambda \iota \psi)$, $\lambda_{\iota} \phi$ (f. nom. sing. $\lambda_{\imath} \psi$, ṡmı $\left.\theta \nu \mu i ́ a ~ H e s y c h.\right) . ~$

## §. 121. Strong and Weak Stems.

The strong form of the stem is kept in Greek in many places where we find in Sanskrit the intermediate or the weak form (consult §. 112). We however find several examples where there is a change of stem in Greek.

The adjectival suffix $\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon \nu \tau}=\mathrm{I}$. E. vant assumes frequently the weak form $\mathrm{F} \varepsilon \tau^{\text {, as }}$ in $\mu \eta \tau \iota \circ$ ó $\sigma \sigma a=\mu \eta \tau \iota \circ \mathrm{F} \varepsilon \tau y a$, fem. of $\mu \eta$ -
 $\chi a \rho\left(F_{\varepsilon \nu \tau-s}, \& c\right.$. The weak form of the stem is also found in the dat. pl. masc. $\chi$ р $\rho i \varepsilon \sigma \iota=\chi a \rho \iota F \varepsilon \tau \sigma \iota, \& c$., and in the comparative and superlative of such adjectives, as $\chi$ a $\rho$ 廹 $\sigma$ - $\tau \rho \circ \rho$,


The above I. E. suffix vant also assumes the weak form For in participles in - $\omega \varsigma$, as $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\nu \kappa} \omega \varsigma=\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\nu \kappa}-$ For-ऽ, $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{v \kappa v ı ̈ a ~}=$ $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{\nu \kappa}-$ For-ya, \&c.: when a vowel precedes Fot, it generally
 $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu \varepsilon \omega \dot{s}=\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu a-F o \tau-s$, \&c. This suffix vant is also supposed to appear in $\kappa v \dot{v} \omega y=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k \hat{u}$-vant, from $k \hat{u}$ (to howl, c. f. Gr. $\kappa \omega-\kappa v i-\omega$ ), which has two stems, the strong $\kappa v o \nu$ and the weak $\kappa v \nu$. In Latin we find this stem appearing as can in can-is,
and cat in cat-ulus, and in Goth. we find it as hund in hund-s, E. hound.

The I. E. suffix mant appears in the strong form $\mu a \nu \tau$ and the weak $\mu a v, \mu a \tau, \mu o v$ : thus we have i $\mu a \nu \tau$ (m. a strap, nom. sing. íás from R. $i=$ Skr. si, to bind, whence siman, f. a boundary, and simanta, m. a separation of the hair on each side, so as to leave a distinct line on the top of the head), beside $i \mu a \tau$ (whence $i \mu a ́ \sigma \sigma \omega=i \mu a \tau y \omega$ and $i \mu a ́ \sigma \theta \lambda \eta=i \mu a \tau \theta \lambda \eta$, a whip), and i $\mu \circ \nu$ (whence i $\mu$ ovıá, the rope of a well), óvouat (n.
 $y \omega$ ), which point back to an older stem ojvouavt, c. f. L. cognoment-um, \&c.; $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho \mu a r$ beside $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho \mu a \nu$ (whence $\sigma \pi \varepsilon \rho-$ $\mu a i \nu \omega), \& c$. Stems in $-\mu \bar{\imath} \nu$ are also connected with those in $\mu a \tau$, as $\dot{\rho} \eta \gamma \mu a \tau$ (n. a breach) with $\dot{\rho} \eta \gamma \mu \bar{\imath} \nu$ (m. breakers), \&c.

The oblique cases of participles whose stems end in ovt and $a \nu \tau$ retain the strong form: but we find a few examples where the weak stem apparently shows itself ; thus we have Æol. $\xi_{\xi}^{\prime} a \sigma \sigma a$ and ${ }_{\xi}^{\ell} \sigma \sigma a$ (fem. of ${ }^{\omega} \nu$, being) which must be for $\dot{\varepsilon} \sigma a \tau y a$ and $\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \tau y a, \sigma a \tau$ being the weak form of participial stem $\boldsymbol{o} \tau \tau=$ I. E. sant $=$ L. sent in $a b-s e n t-e m, \& c$. This weak form of the participle of $\varepsilon \dot{\prime} \mu i$ appears also to be found in $\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \varepsilon$ ós


Nouns of relationship in $\tau \eta \rho$, such as $\pi a \tau \eta \rho, \mu \eta \eta_{\eta} \rho \rho$, have two stems ending in $\tau \varepsilon \rho$ and $\tau \rho$, and may form their oblique
 and $\mu \eta \tau \rho o ́ s$, dat. sing. $\pi a \tau \notin \rho \iota$ and $\pi a \tau \rho i, \mu \eta \tau \xi \rho \iota$ and $\mu \eta \tau \rho i, \& c$.; but in acc. sing. we only find $\pi a \tau \notin \rho a$ and $\mu \eta \tau \varepsilon \rho a, \& c$. , while in dat. pl. the stem ends in $\tau \rho a$, as $\pi a \tau \rho a ́ \sigma \iota, ~ \& c$.

## §. 122. Vocalic Stems.

I. Stems in $-a,-\eta$, and $-o(=$ I. E. $\breve{a}$ and $\bar{a})$.
$1^{\circ}$. Stems in $\circ$ (m. f. n.), as imao (m. f.), форо (m.), voбo (f.), そv $\mathbf{v o}$ (n.), \&c.

Many consonantal stems have side-forms in o, especially in Æolic, where we find the stems aүшvo, фvдако, $\mu \propto \rho \tau \nu \rho о$,
 $=$ aíyous from stem acyo.*
$2^{\circ}$. Stems in $-\breve{a},-\bar{a},-\eta$, as $\mu$ ov $\breve{a}$ (f. nom. sing. $\mu o \tilde{v} \sigma a$ ),
 $\nu \varepsilon a \nu u \bar{a}$ (m. nom. sing. vєavías), ${ }^{' E \rho \mu \eta}$ (m. nom. sing. ${ }^{\top} \mathrm{E}_{\rho \mu \bar{\eta} \varsigma)}$ $i \pi \pi o \tau a ̆ a ̆(m . ~ n o m . ~ s i n g . ~ E p . ~ i \pi \pi \pi o ́ t a ̆), ~ \& c . ~$
II. Stems ending in $-\iota$, as $\pi$ ool ( m . for $\pi$ or $=$ Skr. pati), $\delta \eta \rho \iota$ (f. strife), $\pi \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\iota}$ (f.), $\kappa \bar{i}$ (m. a worm), $\sigma \iota \nu a \pi \iota$ (n. mustard), $i \delta \rho \iota$ ( m . f. knowing), \&c. Some stems in $-a$ and $-o$ became $\iota^{-}$ stems by throwing out these vowels, as Dor. $\Delta$ eivl-s, $=\Delta \varepsilon$ evía-s and in later Greek $\Delta \eta \mu \ddot{\eta} \tau \rho \iota-\varsigma=\Delta \eta \mu \eta \eta^{\prime} \rho \iota o-\varsigma, \Delta \iota o \nu \bar{v} \sigma \iota-\varsigma=\Delta \iota o^{-}$ vv́sıo-c.
III. Stems in $-v$, as $\iota \chi^{\theta v}$ (m.), $\pi \eta \chi^{v}$ (m.), $\varepsilon \gamma \chi^{£} \lambda v$ (f.), $\delta a-$ $\kappa \rho v(\mathrm{n}),. \dot{a} \sigma \tau v(\mathrm{n}),. \gamma \lambda \nu \kappa v$ (m. n.), \&c.
IV. Diphthongal stems, as vav (f.), $\gamma \rho a v$ (f.), фovєv (m.), $\beta a \sigma i \lambda \varepsilon v$ (m.), vív (m. beside vio), 'A ${ }^{\prime} \varepsilon v$ ( m . beside ' ' $\rho \varepsilon \varepsilon$ and ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{A} \rho q$ ), Z zv (m.), \&c.; oi (m. f. a sheep, the only diphthongal stem in ot; it is also an $t$-stem, òï); $\beta o v$ (m. f.), $\chi o v$ (m. conguis).

The original stem of $\lambda a ̈ a s$ or $\lambda a ̈ s$ (m. a stone), was probably $\lambda a F$ : its declension is very similar to that of $\nu a u ̈ s$, thus we have gen. sing. $\lambda$ ãos (beside $\lambda$ áou, as if from an $\alpha$-stem $\lambda \tilde{a} a$ ), dat. sing. $\lambda a ̈ \ddot{u}$, acc. sing. $\lambda a ̈ a$ (beside $\lambda a ̈ a \nu$ and $\lambda a ̈ \nu$ from
 be inferred from the words $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \dot{\omega} \omega$ (I stone), $\lambda \varepsilon u \sigma \mu$ ós, \&e. Bopp and Benfey connect it with Skr. grâvan (m. a stone).

## Latin Stems.

## §. 123. Guttural Stems.

I. Stems in $-c$ (nom. sing. m. f. n. $x$ and $c$ ): făc (f. a torch), pāc (f.) ferāc (m. f. n. fruitful), něc (f.), halēc (nom. sing. f. halex, and n. halec, brine of fish), saltc (f. a willow),

[^85]supplić(m. f. n.), radīc (f.), felīc (m. f. n.), Cappadöc (m.), prrecŏc (m. f. n.) vōc (f.), atrōc (m. f. n.), crŭc (f.), trŭc (m. f. n.) Pollūc (m.), \&c.
II. Stems in $-g$ (nom. sing. $x$ ) : grĕg (m.), rēg (m.), rem̌̆g (m.), Allobrơg (m.), conjüg (m. f.), frūg (f.), \&c.

## §. 124. Dental Stems.

I. Stems in -t (which is lost before the nom. sing. $s$, the preceding vowel being frequently lengthened in 'compensation): anăt (f. a duck), atāt (f.), abiĕt (f.), quiēt (f.), mil̄̄̈t (m.), līt (f.), cōt (f. a whetstone), virtūt (f.), \&c. Oss (n. a bone), mell (n.), fell (n.), were originally $t$-stems, for oss $=$ ost (as messis $=$ mes-tis $=$ met-tis from R. met, cf. Gr. ò $\sigma \tau-o \tilde{\nu} \nu$, mell $=$ melt (c. f. Gr. $\mu \varepsilon \lambda_{\iota \tau}$, Goth. milith, honey), fell = felt, and this perhaps for fel-ti.
II. Stems in $-d$ (which is lost before the nom. sing. $s$, the preceding vowel being frequently lengthened in compensation) : văd (m. a surety), pĕd (m.), herēd (m. f.), obsĭd (m. a hostage), custōd (m.), pecŭd (f.), palūd (f.), \&c.:
III. Stems in $-s$ : măs (m. a male), vās (n. a vessel), genĕs (n. nom. sing. genus, gen. sing. generis = genesis), cinǔs (m. gen. sing. cineris $=$ cinisis, the second $i$ becoming $e$ through the influence of the succeeding $r$ ), glis ( m. a dormouse), arbơs ( f . nom. sing. arbor and arbos), corpors (n. nom. sing. corpus), $m \bar{o} s(\mathrm{~m}),. \bar{o} s(\mathrm{n}),$. Lemŭs (m. ghosts, found only in plural Lemŭres), Ligŭs (m.) s, jūs (n.), mūs (m.), \&c. Farr (n. corn) is probably for fars, rs becoming rr, as in ferre for ferse, and as $l s$ becomes $l l$ in velle for velse. Väs (n. gen. sing. vasis), is the only stem that retains $s$ throughout its whole declension; in other stems it becomes $t$ between two vowels. The Latin infinitive in -re is perhaps the dative of an old stem in as; $l_{e}$ gere would then be for leg-es-e, just as in Vedic similar datives are used as infinitives, such as sahasê (to strengthen, lit. for strengthening, Rig. I. 16, 6), \&c.
IV. Stems in $n$ : rēn (m. the kidney), liēn (m. the spleen, beside lieni) ; stems in -min = I. E. -man, nom. sing. (-men), as nomin (n.), agmin (n.), \&c. ; flamin (m. nom. sing. flamen), tibicin (m.), tubicin (m.), pectin (m.), sanguin (nom. sing. m. sanguis, and n. sanguen), homin (m. nom. sing. homo), from an older homōn which is found in O. L. acc. sing. homonem and hemönem, cardin (m. a hinge, nom. sing. cardo), praedōn (m. nom. sing. preedo), carn (f. nom. sing. caro), for caron, \&c. The stems of canis and juvenis were originally $n$-stems, as we see from the gen. pl. can-um and juven-um, and the corresponding Sanskrit stems s'van and yuvan, nom. sing. s'vâ and yuvâ.
V. Stems ending in $-r$ : baccăr ( n . a kind of berry), calcür (n. a spur), carcěr (m.), vēr (n.), wquör (n.), dolōr (m.), fulgür (n.), für (m.), \&c.
VI. Stems ending in $-l$ : săl (m. n. salt), animāl (n.), pugǔl (m.), sōl (m.), cons

## §. 125. Labial Stems.

I. Stems ending in $-p: \operatorname{dap}$ (f.), adip (m. f. nom. sing. adeps, fat); compounds, the latter part of which is deriveds from. R. cap (to take), as princip (m. nom. sing. princeps), aucup (m. nom. sing. auceps), \&c.
II. Stems ending in $-b$ : urb (f.), stems in $-b$ are generally short forms of other stems, as pleb (f. nom. sing. plebs), is for plebi (gen. pl. plebi-um), scrob (m. f. a ditch), is for scrobi, \&c.
III. There is only one stem in $m$, viz., hiem (f. nom. sing. hiems and hiemps).
IV. There is only one stem in $-v$, viz., nigv (f. snow, nom. sing. nix, gen. sing. nivis) beside ningui.

## §. 126. Strong and weak Stems.

The distinction between strong and weak stems has only manifested itself in Latin in a few cases: thus patr is the weak
form of St. pater, and from it in Classical Latin the oblique cases of pater are formed, whereas in Old Latin $e$ was retained, as in the gen. sing. Diespiter-is, Opiter-is, \&c., similarly ventr, mater, are the weak forms of the stems venter and mater.

Carn is the weak form of carōn (nom. sing. caro) and may be compared with Skr. râg' $\vec{n}$, the weak form of St. râg'ân.

The participles in -ant and -ent retain their strong forms throughout their declensions, but it is possible that the weak form may show itself in the following examples : pariĕt (m. a wall, nom. sing. paries) from par $=$ Skr. pari $=$ Gr. $\pi \varepsilon \rho i$ and ient (going), and therefore, meaning literally, "what goes round," abiet (f. the fir), from $a b$ and ient, and meaning literally "what goes up," teget (f. a mat, lit. "what covers" for tegent, part. of teg-o), potestat for potet-tat $=$ potent-tat, egestat for eget-tat $=$ egent-tat, while we have the strong form of the participial stem in voluntat, O. herentat.

## §. 127. Vocalic Stems.

I. Stems ending in $-a(a, e, o)$.
$1^{\circ}$. Stems in $-a$ (which lose the final $s$ of the nom. sing. although it originally existed there, as in paricidas found in the law of Numa, and hosticapas, i. e. hostium captor), as equă (f. originally equā), incolă (m.), form $\breve{a}$ (f. but form $\bar{a}$ on the inscription on the tomb of the Scipios), aquilă (f. but aquilä in Ennius), \&c. Greek nouns in -as lose the final $s$ when borrowed by the Latin, as Pintia (for $\Phi$ เขtías), Apella, Mena, \&c., Gr. $\pi о \iota \eta \tau \eta ́ s$ (m.) becomes poeta and $\chi$ á $\rho \tau \eta \mathrm{\eta}$ (m.) becomes charta (f.)
$2^{\circ}$. Stems ending in $-e$ (all of which are feminine except dies, which is either masculine or feminine, while meridies is always masculine) : re (nom. sing. res), fide (f.), plebe (f.) \&c. These stems are closely connected with those in $-a$, and we frequently find two forms of the same stem existing beside each other, one ending in $-a$ and another in $-e$, as barbaria and barbarie, materia and materie, effigia and effigie, \&c.
$3^{\circ}$. Stems in 0 : equo ( m. nom. sing. equos, later equus), alvo (f. the stomach, nom. sing. alvos, later alvus), jugo (n. nom. sing. jugom, later jugum), \&c. We frequently find stems in $-a$ beside stems in -0 , as transfuga beside profugo, collega beside sacrilego, Graiugena beside Asiageno and privigno (= privigeno), \&c. When $r$ preceded $o$, the latter was generally dropped and $e$ inserted in the nom. sing. when another consonant immediately preceded, as in caper $=\mathrm{Gr} . \kappa a \pi \rho o^{-}$s, ager $=$ Gr. áypós, \&c. : this inserted $e$ was not retained in the oblique cases, as in gen. sing. capri, agri, \&c., except where it belonged to the root, as in corniger, armiger, prosper (from pro and R. sper, whence sper-o, spes, O. L. acc. pl. sper-es), \&c., and in some other cases as O. L. magisteres = magisteri, dexteri beside dextri, \&c. In many cases $o$ is retained in the nominative after $r$, as in $0 . \mathrm{L}$. socerus $=$ socer, $0 . \mathrm{L}$. puerus $=$ puer (= poverus, which also became por in the proper names, Marcipor, Publipor, \&c., and was then declined as a stem in $-r$ ), O. L. vulturus $=$ vultur, numerus, umerus, uterus, prosperus $=$ prosper, herus, verus, laurus, taurus, severus, serus, mirus, virus, -parus (oviparus), -vorus (carnivorns), purus, murus. After $l o$ is only omitted in famul beside famulus, and nihil = nihilum, just as in N. U. katel $=\mathrm{L}$. catulus and O . O . Mutil $=$ Mutilos.
$O$ is also lost in nom. sing. in O. L. damnas for damnats $=$ damnatos, just as in N. U. taçez $=\mathrm{L}$. tacitos, O. O. hürz $=\mathrm{L}$. hortos, \&c. In Old Latin $o$ was lost after $i$, and then the nom. sing. $s$ was itself frequently lost, as in Clodis and Clodi $=$ Claudius, Cornelis, and Corneli = Cornelius, \&c.

0 was written in the nom. sing. of all $o$-stems until about the middle of the third century, B. C., when $u$ took its place, except in stems ending in $-v o$, in which $o$ was still written, as in servo-s, equo-s, \&c.
II. Stems ending in $-i$ (nom. sing. m. f. $-i$, and $-e s$, n. -e) : amni (m. nom. sing. amnis), torqui (m. f. nom. sing. torquis and torques), avi (f. nom. sing. avis), scroli
(f. a ditch. nom. sing. scrobs and scrobis), sinapi (mustard, nom. sing. f. sinapis, and n. sinape), mari (n. nom. sing. mare, pl. mari-a), sali (n. the sea, nom. sing. sale beside St. sal), oisi (n. a bone, nom. sing. osse beside St. oss), lacti (n. milk, nom. sing. lacte beside St. lact), \&c. In nouns formed with suffix $-t i$ the stem of the nom. sing. generally ends in -t as menti (f. nom. sing. mens = ments), morti (f. nom. sing. mors $=$ morts ), juventuti (f. nom. sing. juventus $=$ juventuts), civitati (f. nom. sing. civitas $=$ civitats), \&c. Stems ending in -ri often lose the final $i$ and insert $e$ before $r$, like stems in -ro; imbri (m. nom. sing. imber), acri (m. f. n. nom. sing. m. acer and acris), silvestri (m. f.n. nom. sing. m silvester and silvestris), \&c. Similarly $i$ is sometimes lost when preceded by $l$ as in vigili (m. f. n. nom. sing. m. vigil), pugili (m. nom. sing. pugil), \&c. $I$ is frequently added to adjectival stems in $-u$, and thus new stems in $-i$ are formed, as brevi $=$ bregu- $i$ from $b r e g u=G r . \beta \rho a \chi v$, gravi $=$ garu- $i$ from garu $=$ Gr. $\beta a \rho v$ $=$ Skr. guru, levi = legu-i from legu = Gr. $̇ \lambda \lambda a \chi v=$ Skr. laghu, suavi $=$ suadu-i from suadu $=$ Gr. $\dot{\eta} \delta v=$ Skr. svâdu, pingui from ping $u=$ Gr. $\pi a \chi v$, tenui from ten $u=$ Gr. $\tau a \nu v=$ Skr. tanu. $\quad 1$ is also frequently employed to lengthen consonantal stems, as in voc-i-bus, duc-i-bus for voc-bus duc-bus, amant-i-a, amant-ium, amant-i-bus, \&c. Vates is for vats (gen. pl. vat-um), from a root = Z. vat (to speak); canis (and canes) is for cans (gen. pl. can-um) ; navis is for navs $=$ Gr. vav̈ $=$ Skr. nâus ; O. L. Jovis (nom. sing.) = Jovs = Gr. Zev́s = Skr. dyâus, bovis or bos $=$ bovs $=$ Gr. $\beta_{o v ̃ s}=$ Skr. gâus.
III. Stems ending in $-u$ : fructu (m.), lacu (m.), socru (f.), manu (f.), cornu (n.), genu (n.). These stems are often interchanged with others in -0 : thus beside the stems senatu, $t u-$ multu, cupressu, рени (provisions), \&c., we also find the stems senato, tumulto, cupresso, peno (n.), \&c. In some cases we find consonantal side forms of $u$-stems, as pecŭd (f.), and pe$\cos$ ( n .) beside реси ( n .), impet (m.) beside impetu (m.), penos ( $\quad$.$) beside репи (f.).$

No Latin stem ends in a diphthong.

## The Cases.

## §. 128. The Nominative Singular.

The nominative singular masculine and feminine is formed from the stem by the addition of $s$, which is derived from the pronominal root $s a(s a=\mathrm{Gr} . \delta, s \hat{a}=\mathrm{Gr} . \dot{\eta})$. The nominative singular neuter is identical with the acc. sing. and consequently adds $m$ to the stem in the case of $a$-stems, while in all others it is identical with the stem itself, subject only to the euphonic laws peculiar to each language.

1. Sanskrit Nom. Sing. In all consonantal stems $s$ is omitted, and in some cases the vowel of the final syllable is lengthened in compensation for this omission, and in others not: thus durmanấs $=$ durmanas $+s$, is nom. sing. of St. durmanas $=\mathrm{Gr} . \delta v \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon$, whereas bharan $=$ bharant $+s$, is nom. sing. of St. bharant $=$ Gr. $\phi$ ¢ $\rho \circ \nu \tau . \quad$ Masc. and fem. stems in - $\hat{a} r$ and -ar reject both $r$ and $s$, and form their nom. sing. in $-\hat{a}$ : thus pit $\hat{a}$ is nom. sing. of St. pitar = Grr. $\pi a \tau \varepsilon \rho$, and dât $\hat{a}$ is nom. sing. of St. dât $\hat{t} r=$ Gr. סorne. Masc. and fem. nouns in -an and -in reject both $n$ and $s$, and lengthen preceding vowel : thus, râg'â is nom. sing. of St. râg'an (m. a king), and dhanî is nom. sing. of St. dhanin (rich). In all vocalic stems $s$ is retained, except in feminine ones which end in $-\hat{a}$ or $-\hat{\imath}$, if the latter are polysyllabic. When $\hat{a}$ however belongs to the root, $s$ remains as in vis'vapâ-s (m. and f. all preserving, from ris'va, all, and p $\hat{a}$, to preserve), dhanad $\hat{a}-s$ ( m . and f . wealth-giving, from dhana, wealth and d $\hat{a}$ to give).*
II. Greek Nom. Sing. In the case of guttural and labial stems, $s$ is simply added, and the nom. sing. ends in $\xi$ and $\psi$, as $\psi u ́ \lambda a \xi$ from St. $\psi v \lambda a \kappa$ (m.), $\phi \lambda o ́ \xi$ from St. $\phi \lambda o \gamma$ (f.), ${ }^{\circ} \psi$ from St. ó (f.), \&c. In dental stems $\tau$ and $\delta$ are never kept

[^86]before s, but always disappear, and the preceding vowel is generally lengthened in compensation: thus we have $\chi$ ápıs from $\chi a \rho ı \tau$ (f.), $\lambda a \mu \pi a \varsigma$ from $\lambda a \mu \pi a \delta\left(\right.$ f. $\left.^{\prime}\right), \pi o u ́ s$ from $\pi o \delta(\mathrm{~m}$.$) ,$ $\tau \varepsilon \tau v \phi \omega ́ s$ from $\tau \varepsilon \tau v \pi$ Fot, $\nu v ́ \xi$ from $\nu v \kappa \tau$, \&c. In סá $\mu a \rho ̧$ from $\delta_{a \mu a \rho \tau}$ (f.) both $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ disappear. Stems in $\boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\tau}$ sometimes lose both consonants before $\sigma$, as in $\tau u ́ \psi a \bar{s}$ from $\tau v \psi a \nu \tau$, סoús from $\delta o \nu \tau, \theta$ zís from $\theta \varepsilon \nu \tau, \& c$, and sometimes lose $\tau$ and $\varsigma$, retaining $\nu$, as in $\phi \varepsilon \rho \omega \nu$ from $\phi \varepsilon \rho o \nu \tau, \& c$. The Æolic dialect kept $\boldsymbol{\nu}$ before $\varsigma$, as in $\tau_{\iota} \theta^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v} \boldsymbol{\nu}=\tau \iota \theta \varepsilon i \varsigma$, and in this respect is similar to Zend, Latin, Lithuanian, and Old Prussian ; thus we have Z. barains $=\mathrm{L}$. ferens $=$ Gr. $\phi \hat{\rho} \rho \omega \nu$, Lith. degans (burning), O. P. sidans (sitting), \&c. In $\nu$-stems the nasal is sometimes thrown out and the preceding vowel lengthened, as in $\tau a ́ \lambda \bar{a} s$ from $\tau a \lambda a \nu, \kappa \tau \varepsilon i ́ s$ from $\kappa \tau \varepsilon \nu$, \&c., while in other cases the nasal is retained and the preceding vowel lengthened to compensate for the loss of $\varsigma$, as in $\tau \in \rho \eta \nu$ from $\tau \varepsilon \rho \varepsilon \nu, \phi \varrho \dot{\eta} \nu$ from $\phi \rho \varepsilon \nu$ (f.), $\mu \varepsilon i \zeta \omega \nu$ from $\mu \varepsilon \iota \zeta_{0 \nu}, \chi \theta \dot{\omega} \nu$ from $\chi \theta$ ov (f.), \&c. We often find a later nominative in $\nu$ beside an older one in $\varsigma$, as $\theta_{i} \nu$ beside $\theta_{i} \mathrm{~s}$, $\delta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \phi_{i} \nu$ beside $\delta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \phi i \varsigma, \& c . \Sigma$ is lost after $\rho$, as in $\chi_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon_{\rho}$ from $\chi € \rho$ (f.), $\pi a \imath \dot{a} \dot{\eta} \rho$ from $\pi a \tau \varepsilon \rho(\mathrm{~m}),. \& \mathrm{c} .:$ whereas in Æolic both con-
 $\mu a \rho \tau v \rho, \rho$ appears to be lost before $s$. The solitary $\lambda$-stem (ü $\quad{ }_{c}$ ) retains both $\lambda$ and $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$. In $\varsigma$-stems $\boldsymbol{\varsigma}$ is lost, and the preceding vowel lengthened as in $\delta v \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \eta \dot{\prime}$ from $\delta v \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \varsigma$.

In vocalic stems $\varsigma$ is simply added to stem, as in áyoós

 minine stems in $\bar{a}(\eta)$ as $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho a$, кою $\eta, \& c$., and in the Homeric
 \&c.
III. Latin Nom. Sing. In guttural and labial stems $s$ is simply added to the stem, as in vox, halex, lex, auceps, urbs, \&c., from the stems voc (f.), halec (f.), leg. (f.), aucup (m.), $u r b$ (f.), \&c. In the case of adjectival stems this $s$ is also retained in the neuter nom., as audax (m.f. n.), ferox (m. f. n.),
\&c.: atriplex (the orach) is also neuter, and halec (n.) is a side-form of halex (f.) In dental stems $t$ and $d$ disappear before $s$, and the preceding vowel was originally lengthened in compensation ; this lengthening is only found in Classical Latin, in monosyllables, and where the preceding syllable ends in $i$, as in $p \bar{e} s=p \check{e} d+s, v \bar{a} s=v \breve{a} d+s$, ariēs $=$ ariĕt $+s$, pariēs $=$ pariët $+s, a b i \bar{e} \stackrel{e}{s}=a b i e ̈ t+s$; in other cases the vowel has become short as in milěs $=$ milet $+s$, peděs $=$ pedet $+s$, \&c. Participial stems in $-n t$ only reject $t$, as in amans $=$ amant $+s, \& c$. In Old Latin and in the vulgar dialect we find $n$ also lost in infas, sapies, \&c. for infans, sapiens, \&c. : compare Gr. тúұas for $\tau v \psi a \nu \tau+s$. In these stems in $-n t s$ is also retained in the neuter nom. as sapiens (m.f. $\dot{\mathrm{n}}$.), \&c. In $s$-stems $s$ is lost, and the preceding vowel, although originally lengthened as in Greek, is generally short in Classical Latin. Traces, however, of its having been originally lengthened still remain, as in Cerēs (f.) from St. Cerěs, arbōs (f.) from St. arbŏs, \&c. In the declension of these stems the final $s$ became $r$ in the oblique cases, except in vas ; and in the case of masculine and feminine nouns this $r$ often supplanted the final $s$ of the nominative, especially in later Latin; thus we have puber (m.) beside pubes, arbor (f.) beside arbōs, sudor (m.) for sudōs = Gr. iǫ̧́w, honor (m.) beside honos, vomer (m. a ploughshare) beside vomis (m.), lepor ( m . wit) beside lepos from St. lepōs (gen. sing. lepōr-is) \&c. The nom. sing. ends in-us in lepus (m. a hare), from St. lepŏs, and in vetus ( m . old) beside veter ( m . id.) used by Ennius. Neuter stems in -os retain the final $s$ in nom. sing., yet we find robur ( n .) = Skr. râdhas ( n . strength) and calor used as a neuter in Plautus Merc. 660, nec calor nec frigus metuo. Masculine and feminine stems in $-n$ lose the final $-n s$ in the nom. : thus we have homo for homōns, combibo (m.) for combibōns, \&c. In some cases $n$ is retained, as in pecten (m.), flamen (m.), \&c., and in sanguis for sanguins, $s$ is kept and $n$ lost. $S$ is always lost after $r$ and $l$, but the preceding vowel was originally lengthened in compensation as in Greek: thus we have lector ( $m$.) for
lector $+s$, mater (f.) for mater $+s$, sol (m.) for sol $+s, p \bar{a} r(m$. for $p a ̆ r+s, s \bar{a} l(\mathrm{~m}$.$) for s \breve{a} l+s, \& c$.

In the $i$ - and $u$-stems $s$ is kept, as in amni-s (m.) fructu-s (m.), \&c. In stems ending in $-t i, i$ is frequently lost before $s$, as in mens (f.) for ment $+s=$ menti $+s$, mors (f.) for mort $+s$ $=$ morti $+s$, vetustas (f.) for vetustat $+s=$ vetustati $+s$, senectus (f.) for senectut $+s=$ senectuti $+s, \& \mathrm{c}$. After $r$ and $l$, is was lost in masculine stems and $e$ was inserted before $r$, when another consonant immediately preceded, as acer for $a c r i+s$, equester for equestri $+s$, \&c.: the full form is kept in the fem. nom. acris, equestris, \&c. Similarly we have vigil for and beside vigilis. In neuter stems $i$ was sometimes lost and sometimes changed into $e$, as in animal, calcar, \&c., and mare, exemplare (also exemplar), \&c. Stems ending in -0 also retain $s$, as servo-s (m.), equo-s (m.), \&c., except when $r$ precedes, in which case $-o s(-u s)$ is often lost, as in ager for agro $+s$, puer for puero $+s, \& c$. $O(u)$ was sometimes lost after $t$, and then $t$ disappeared, as in damnas for damnato-s ; similarly we find O. U. pihaz, N. U. pihos = L. piatus, O. O. hirz = L. hortus, N. U. taçez $=$ L. tacitus. After $i$ o was sometimes lost, as in Cornelis for Cornelius, Clodis for Clodius, \&c., and then $s$ sometimes disappears, as in Corneli, \&c., which occur as nom. s. on inscriptions : similarly in Oscan we find Heirennis for Herennius, in which $u$ first became $i$ or $i$ (as in Pupidiis $=$ L. Popidius, Viinikiis $=$ L. Vinicius) and then $i^{e}$ or $i i$ became $i$. We also find $o(u)$ lost after $n$ in Umbrian, as in Ikuvins $=$ L. Iguvinus, and in Oscan, as in Bantins $=$ L. Bantinus, Pumpaiians $=$ L. Pompeianus. $O$ is lost after $k$ in 0.0 . tütiks $=$ L. tuticus. Feminine stems in $-\bar{a}$ have entirely lost $s$, and $-\bar{a}$ has become $-\breve{a}$ in Classical Latin: Bücheler suggests that the change of final $-\bar{a}$ of nom. sing. into $-\breve{a}$ was contemporaneous with that of final $-\bar{a} d$ of abl. sing. into $-\bar{a}$. In Old Umbrian this $\bar{a}$ sometimes became $u$, and in New Umbrian it always became $o$, as in O. U. tuta, tutu, N. U. toto = tuta $(\mathrm{a}$ city) ; similarly in Old Oscan it became $\dot{u}$, and in New Oscan
o, as in O. O. viü = L. via, O. O. tiutiu, N. O. tovto $=$ tuta. Masculine stems in $-a$, such as incola, nauta, \&c., have also lost $s$, but that they once had it is shown by the forms $p a$ ricidas, hasticapas (see page 246).

## §. 129. The Nominative Plural.

The sign of the nom. pl. appears to have been originally the reduplication of that of the nom. sing. Its oldest form, accordingly, must have been-sasa, whence came firstly -sas and then -as. Sas, as the sign of the nom. pl., occurs in Vedic Sanskrit in the declension of the $a$-stems: thus we have, as nom. pl. dhûmâ-sas from dhûma (m. smoke), dêvâ-sas from dêva (m. a god), pâvakâ-sas from pâvakâ (f. pure). Traces of this -sas also appear in Zend, in which such forms of the nom. pl. as věhrkâonhô (m. wolves) = I. E. varkâ-sas, \&c., point back to older forms in -sas. The nom. pl. neuter is the same as the acc. pl. neuter.

1. Sanskrit Nom. Pl. Masculine and feminine stems form this case always in -as, before which $\check{\imath}$ and $\check{u}$ are gunated; thus we have marut-as from marut ( m . the wind), mâtar-as from mâtar (f. a mother), nâdy-as from nâdî (f. a river), s'ivâs for s'iva + as from s'iva (m. fortunate) or for siv $\hat{a}+a s$ (f. id.), kavay-as from kavi (m. a wise man), dhênav-as from dhênu (f. a milch cow). In the Veda we find nom. s. of stems in $-\tau$ and $-\breve{u}$ without gunation of these vowels, as ary-as from ari (m. an enemy), mumukshv-as from mumukshu (m. a sage abstracted from all human passion). In Vedic we also find nom. pl. of polysyllabic $i$-stems formed by simply adding $s$ to the stem, as dêvî-s from devî (f. a goddess).
II. Greek Nom. Pl. Masculine and feminine stems form this case by adding $-\varepsilon \varsigma$ to the stem; thus we have $\phi \lambda \in \hat{\varepsilon} \beta-\varepsilon \varsigma$ from $\phi \lambda \varepsilon \beta$ (f. a vein), $\pi о \iota \mu \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\varepsilon}^{\prime}-\varepsilon \varsigma$ from $\pi о \iota \mu \eta \nu_{\nu}$ (m.), $\pi a \tau \notin \rho-\varepsilon s$ from $\pi a \tau \varepsilon \rho$ ( m. ), $i \chi \theta \dot{v}-\varepsilon s$ from $i \chi \theta v$ (m.), кi- $\varepsilon \varsigma$ from кı (m. a worm.

Stems ending in $\check{\imath}$ and $\breve{u}$ may either gunate the final vowel or not, before adding - $\varepsilon \varsigma$ : thus we have as examples of $-\varepsilon \varsigma$ being added to unchanged stem, $\mu$ ávtı $\uparrow \varepsilon \varsigma$ from $\mu a \nu \tau \iota$
 $\nu \varepsilon \kappa v$ (m.), \&c.; and as examples of gunated stems we have, $\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon ı \varsigma, \pi o ́ \lambda \eta \varepsilon \varsigma, \pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon \varsigma=\pi 0 \lambda_{\varepsilon y-\varepsilon \varsigma}$ from $\pi 0 \lambda_{\varepsilon \iota}$, the gunated form of $\pi o \lambda_{\iota}$ (f. a city), whence also we have without gunation, Ion. $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota-\varepsilon \varsigma, \pi o \lambda \varepsilon i \varsigma=\pi 0 \lambda \varepsilon F-\varepsilon \varsigma$ from $\pi 0 \lambda \varepsilon v$, the gunated

 culine and feminine stems in $\sigma$ and $a(=$ Skr. $\breve{\bar{a}}$ ) form their nom. pl. in -o and $-a \iota$, as $i \pi \pi o \iota$ from $i \pi \pi o$ (m.), and $\chi \tilde{\omega} \rho a \iota$ from $\chi \omega \rho a$ (f.) These forms originally ended in $s$ and were not developed till after the Greek and Latin languages separated from each other. The loss of the final $s$ may have occurred first in the nom. pl. of the pronominal stems $\dot{\delta}$ or $\boldsymbol{\tau}, \bar{a}$ or $\tau \bar{a}$. Schleicher suggests that $\tau \circ i(=o i)$, and $\tau a i(=a i)$ may have arisen from $t a-y-a s$ and $t \hat{\alpha}-y-a s$, the pronominal stems $t a$ and $t \hat{\alpha}$ having been increased by $y(i)$ before the addition of -as, and that tayas and tâyas became tai and tâi by the loss of the final syllable. In Sanskrit we find $s$ lost only in the nom. pl. masc. of some pronominal stems, while the fem. retains $s$ : thus yê (m.), beside yâs (f.) from ya (who), tê (m.), beside tâs (f.) from ta (he, she), tyê (m.), beside tyâs (f.), from tya (this), \&c. This similarity between the nom. pl. masc. of the pronouns in Sanskrit and Greek is not sufficient to prove that these nominatives were already developed in Indo-European times. All that can be asserted is that it is just possible that the final $s$ of the nom. pl. was lost in some pronouns before the first separation occurred in the Indo-European family of languages.
III. Latin Nom. Pl. Masculine and feminine consonantal stems originally formed this case by the addition of $-\breve{c}_{s}=\mathrm{Gr}$. $\check{z}$. Final $s$ was frequently lost in Old Latin, as we see from Inscriptions, on which we find such forms as Pisaurese for

Pisaurenses. Even ë itself was also lost, so that the nom. pl. was reduced to the mere stem, as in U. frater (fratres), O . censtur (censores), L. quattuor for quattuor-es, Luceres for Lucerenses, Tities for Titienses, Ramnes for Ramnenses. Consonantal stems, however, perhaps during the third century, B. C. ceased to form their nom. pl. by the addition of -ěs, but, assuming the form of the $i$-stems, formed this case by adding $-\bar{e} s$, as in leg-ēs, bov-ēs, ferent-ēs. The nom. pl. of the $i$-stems ends in -ēs, as ovēs from ovi, hostēs from hosti, \&c.: ē here may be explained in either of two ways, either as being for ie (ovēs $=o v i+\check{\text { ěs, }}$, as $\pi o \lambda_{l-\varepsilon s}$ from $\pi o \lambda_{l}$, without gunation of stem-vowel) or as being for $\check{e}$ (ovēs $=$ ově̌̌s $=o v e y+$ ěs as $\pi v^{\prime}-$ $\lambda \varepsilon \iota \varsigma$ for $\pi 0 \lambda_{\varepsilon} y+\varepsilon_{\varsigma}$ from $\pi o \lambda \iota$, with gunation of stem-vowel). $I$-stems also form their nom. pl. in -eis and $-\bar{\imath} s$, which are probably of later formation than $-\bar{e} s$, although some writers hold that $-\bar{i} s(=-i i s=-i \breve{s})$ was the oldest form. The nom. pl. of the $u$-stems ends in $-\bar{u} s$, as fructūs from fructu: fructūs may either be for fructu + ĕs (as $\nu$ vккєя from $\nu \varepsilon \kappa v$, without gunation of stem-vowel) or for fructov-es (as $\pi$ 向 $\chi \neq \varsigma=\pi \eta \chi^{\mathrm{E} F}-\varepsilon \varsigma$ from $\pi \eta \chi \nu$, with gunation of stem-vowel). The nom. pl. of the $a$ stems ends in -ai, the original termination was - $\bar{\alpha} s$, as may be inferred from the $\mathrm{O} . \mathrm{U}$. urtas $=\mathrm{L}$. ortce, N. U. ivengar $=\mathrm{L}$. juvencce, N. O. scriftas $=$ L. scriptce, N. O. pas $=$ L. quce. Final $s$ was then lost, as we see from inscriptions, on which we find as nom. pl. matrona, \&c., and then after the analogy of the pronominal declension, $i$ was added, and the nom. pl. of these stems ended in -ai, as in tabelai, datai (Sc. de Bacc.), which finally became $a e$. In Classical Latin the nom. pl. of the $o-$ stem ends in $-\bar{i}$, but originally -es was attached immediately to the stem, so that the original termination was -oes. This termination appears in various forms: thus we find as nom. pl. pilumnoe poploe (in Carmen Saliare, explained by Festus as Romani pilis uti assueti), fescenince (qui depellere fascinum credebantur), modies, ques, ploirumē, leibereis, oinvorsei, ministrīs, \&cc. Final $s$ is retained in Oscan and Umbrian : thus we
have O.O. Nüvlanuis $=$ L. Nolani, puitirūis $=$ Gr. $\pi$ ótєpoı, O. U. Ikuvinus, N. U. screitor $=\mathrm{L}$. scripti, \&c. In Latin $\bar{e}$-stems $s$ is kept as in diēs, \&c., but in some cases the pl.is formed from a corresponding $a$-stem, as nom. sing. intemperies or intemperia, nom. pl. intemperic.

## §. 130. The Nominative Dual.

The original termination of the masculine and feminine nominative dual was -sâs, which was merely the lengthened form of the nom. pl. -sas; similarly $\bar{i}$, the case-ending of the nom. dual neuter, is the lengthened form of $-\breve{\imath}$, the case-ending of the nom. pl. neuter, and -bhyâm (for -bhyâms), the case-ending of the dat. abl. and instr. dual, is the lengthened form of -bhyas (for -bhyams), the case-ending of the dat. and abl. pl. As -sas became -as, so -sâs became-âs. That the dual nom. ended in $-\hat{a} s$ is proved by the Zend. nom. dual, which sometimes ends in $-\hat{a} o$, which represents an I. E. $-\hat{a} s$. The nom. acc. and voc. dual have the same case-ending.
I. Sanskrit Nom. Dual. Masculine and feminine stems form this case by the addition of $\hat{a} u$, as marut- $\hat{a} u$ from marut (m.), nady-âu from nad̂̂ (f.), s'ivâu from s'iva (m.), \&c. In Vedic we find $\hat{a}$ for $\hat{a} u$, as in $u b h \hat{a}$ (both), as'vina (the two As'vins), \&c. Masculine and feminine stems in $-\tau$ and $-\breve{u}$ omit - $\hat{a} u$, and in compensation lengthen the final vowel, as in kavî from kav̌̌ (m.), dhên̂̂u from dhênŭ (f.). Feminine stems in $-\hat{a}$ merely change this vowel into - $\hat{e}$, as in s'ivê from s'ivâ (f.). Bopp* considers that the original form of s'ivê was s'ivay$\hat{a} u$ and that, when the final $u$ had been lost, s'ivayâ became s'ivê, as Skr. k'intayâmi (I think), has become k'intêmi in Prâkrit. The nom. neuter is formed by adding $-\hat{\imath}$ to the stem as s'ivê for s'iva $+\hat{\imath}$ from s'iva (n.), vâri-n-̂̀ from vâri (n. water),

[^87]balint from balin (n. strong) : stems ending-in $-\tau$ and $\check{u}$ insert $n$ before - $\hat{\text {. }}$.
II. Greek Nom. Dual. The sign of this case for the three genders is $\varepsilon$ for all stems except those ending in $-a(o, a)$ : thus we have $\mu^{\prime} \lambda a \nu \varepsilon$ (m. n.) from $\mu \varepsilon \lambda a \nu, \dot{\eta} \delta_{\varepsilon \in \varepsilon}$ (m. n.) $=\hat{\eta} \delta_{\varepsilon} F \varepsilon$ from $\dot{\eta} \delta \nu, \pi o ́ \lambda_{\iota \varepsilon}$ from $\pi 0 \lambda_{\imath}$ (f.) beside $\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon \varepsilon$ and $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta \varepsilon=\pi о-$ $\lambda_{\varepsilon} y-\varepsilon, \& \in$, In the $a$-stems the dual case-ending coalesces with the stem-vowel : thus we have ì $i \pi \omega$ from $i \pi \pi o$ (m.), кó $\rho \bar{a}$ from корā (f.), \&c.
III. Latin Nom. Dual. There are only two dual nom. s. in Latin, $d u \bar{o}$ and $a m b \bar{o}: d u \bar{o}=$ Skr. $d v \hat{a ̂ u}=\mathrm{Gr} . \delta \delta^{\prime} \omega, a m b o=$ Skr. $u b h \hat{a} u=$ Gr. ${ }^{\circ} \mu \phi \omega$.

## §. 131. The Accusative Singular.

This case in all masculine and feminine nouns ended in $-m$, which was attached immediately to the stem if it ended in a vowel, or by means of $-a$ if it ended in a consonant. In the $a$-stems the neuter acc. sing. was formed by adding $-m$, but in all other neuters the stem and the acc. sing. were identical. The acc. sign. $-m$ or $-a m$ is perhaps connected with the pronominal root which is found in Skr. am-u (that), $i-m e ̂$ (those), \&e.
I. Sanskrit Acc. Sing. Masculine and feminine consonantal stems add -am, as marut-am (m.), bharant-am (m.), pitar-am (m.), \&c. The acc. sing. neut. is merely the stem itself, subject to the euphonic laws of Sanskrit, as bharat (n.) from St. bharant, hrt (n.) from St. hrd, \&c. Vocalic stems add $-m$, as $s^{\prime} i v a-m$ (m.), s'ivâ-m (f.), kavi-m (m.), nadî-m (f.), \&c. Monosyllabic vocalic stems, however, except those in - $\hat{o}$, add -am, as nâv-am from $n \hat{a} u$ (f.), bhiy-am from bl̂̂ (f. fear), bhuv$a m$ from bhî (f. the earth), \&c. The acc. sing. neut. of stems in $-i$ and $-u$ is merely the stem, but in the $a$-stems $m$ is added, as in siva-m from siva (n.). The nom. sing. neut. and the acc. sing. neuter are the same.
II. Greek Acc. Sing. Masculine and feminine consonantal stems add $-a$ for $-a \nu=$ I. E. $-a m$, as in $\lambda a \mu \pi a ́ \delta-a(f),. \phi t{ }^{-}$ $\rho o v \tau-a(\mathrm{~m}),. \pi a \tau \varepsilon \rho^{\prime}-a$ (m.), \&c. Masculine and feminine vocalic stems, except those ending in $\varepsilon v$, add $-\nu$, as $\mu a ́ v \tau \iota-\nu$ (m.), $\nu$ ékv-v

 i\& $\varepsilon \& F-a$ (m.). Beside $\nu a \tilde{v}-\nu$ (f.) we find Hom. $\nu \tilde{\eta} F-a$ and $\nu \in \mathbb{F}-a$;
 we have both $\varepsilon \dot{v} \rho \dot{u}-\nu$ and $\varepsilon \dot{v} \rho \rho \in-\alpha=\varepsilon \dot{\rho} \rho \varepsilon F-a$, \&c. In consonantal stems and those ending in $-\iota$ and $-v$, the acc. neuter is merely the stem, subject to the euphonic laws of the Greek language, while in o-stems it ends in $-\nu$; thus we have $\tau$ fepas (n.), for
 $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \dot{v}$ ( n ), $\boldsymbol{\sigma o \phi o ́ - \nu}$ (n.), \&c. Stems ending in -七о (= I. E. $-y a)$ sometimes lose $o$ in later Greek, as in $\mu$ áprv $\rho \iota \nu$ for $\mu a \rho-$ rópo- $\nu$, \&c.; similarly in Umbrian we find terti- $m=$ tertio- $m$,
 $\mu a \rho \tau \tau \nu=\mu a ́ \rho \tau \tau o \nu, \& c$.
III. Latin Acc. Sing. Masculine and feminine consonantal stems form this case in $-e m$, thus agreeing in form with the $i$ stems: thus we have voc-em (f.), ferent-em (m. f.), patr-em, \&c. This -em does not represent an I. E. -am, as has been suggested by some writers, but the consonantal stems were lengthened by $i$, which became $e$ before the acc. sing. $-m$. Masculine and feminine vocalic stems add - $m$, as fructu-m, (m.), bona-m (f.), bono-m (m.), \&c. In the $i$-stems the stemvowel generally becomes $e$, as this vowel is more easily pronounced with $m$ than $i$; but we nevertheless find $i$ retained in many feminine stems, as febri-m, siti-m, tussi-m, Tiberi-m, vi-m, navi-m (also nave-m), \&c. The acc. s sing. of su-s (f.) and gru-s (f.) are su-em (compare Gr. $\sigma \tilde{v}-v$ and $\tilde{v}-\nu$ ) and gruem . In neuter stems the acc. sing. is merely the stem, subject to the euphonic laws of Latin: thus we have lac for lact, mel for mell = melt, cor for cord, mare for mari, nomen, \&c. In some cases the acc. sing. neuter agrees with the nom. sing.
masc., as in such forms as feren-s for ferent-s, audac-s, \&c. In Umbrian and Oscan the acc. sing. ends in - $m$, as in Latin, and this $m$ very often disappears, as in Old Latin: thus in Umbrian we have O. U. puplum $=\mathrm{N} . \mathrm{U}$. poplom $=\mathrm{L}$. populum; O. U. tutam = N. U. totam, N. U. Fisim = Fisiom, N. U. tertim $=$ L. tertiom, \&c.; and in Oscan, O. O. hurtim $=$ L. hortum, viam and via $=\mathrm{L}$. viam, \&c. Consonantal stems in Umbrian do not go over to the $i$-declension, as in Latin, but form their acc. in $-u m$ or $-u$, and $-o m$ or -0 , as 0 . U. ūhtūru $=$ L. auctorem, N. U. curnaco $=\mathrm{L}$. cornicem, \&c.

## §. 132. The Accusative Plural.

The accusative plural of masc. and fem. stems appears to have been formed by adding $s$ to the acc. singular; its ending was, therefore, originally $-n s(=-m s)$, the labial $m$ becoming the dental $n$ on account of the following dental $s$. Traces of this $-n s$ are found in Sanskrit, Zend, Greek, and Latin; but it is kept perfect in Gothic vocalic stems, for the euphonic laws of this language did not forbid such a combination as $n s$, occurring at the end of a word. The acc. pl. neuter and the nom. pl. neuter were formed by adding $-a$ to the stem.
I. Sanskrit Acc. Pl. Masculine and feminine consonantal and monosyllabic vocalic stems form this case by adding -as to the stem, as marut-as from marut, bhiy-as (f.) from bhî, \&c. Masculine vocalic stems, ending in a short vowel, form their acc. sing. by adding $n$, and lengthening the stem-vowel : thus we have s'ivân = s'iva-ns from s'iva (m.), kavîn $=k a v i-n s$ from kavi (m.), \&c. The acc. pl. of masc. stems in tar ends in $t \stackrel{r}{n}$, as pi-tṛ̂n, \&c.; but an older termination was -tar-as, as in Vedic pitar-as from pitar. Feminine vocalic stems form their acc. pl. by adding $s$, and lengthening the stem-vowel, when it is short, as in gatis = gati-ns from gati (f. motion), $s^{\prime} i v a ̂ s=s^{\prime} i v \hat{a}-n s$ from sivâ (f.), \&c. We find traces of the termination -ns still appearing in Sanskrit, as in kâis, the acc.
pl. of $k a$ ( m . who), which occurs only before $k a \hat{n}$, the regulax form : thus kâns kan = O. Pr. kans kans, compare Gothic acc. pl. hvans, found in hvans-uh (quoscunque).* In Vedic also masc. stems in $-i$ and $-u$ form their acc. pl. in $-i \bar{n} r,-\hat{u} \bar{n} r \dagger$ before vowels, and occasionally before $y, v$, and $h$, as in girin $\bar{r}$ from giri (m. a mountain), rtî̂nr from rtu (m. a season), vasûn̄r from vasu (m.); we also find in Vedic n? $\hat{\eta} \eta h$ and $n \hat{r} \bar{n} r$ as the acc. pl. of $n a r$ (m. a man) : in these cases $-\bar{n} r$ and $-\bar{n} h$ represent an original -ns; compare the Gothic acc. s pl. gasti-ns, sunu-ns from gasti and sunu, and Z. nĕr-a-ns. Neuter vocalic stems form the acc. pl. by lengthening the stem-vowel, and adding $n i$; neuter consonantal stems add $i$, and insert $n$ before the final consonant, except in the case of stems ending in a nasal, or $y, r, l$, and $v$ : thus we have s'iv $\hat{a}-n i$ from $s^{\prime} i v a$ (n.), vârî-ni from vari (n. water), tâlû-ni from tâlu (n. the palate), g'aganti from $g^{\prime} a g a t$ ( n . the world), hrndi from $h r d$ ( n . the heart), \&c. Stems ending in $-s$ or $-n$ also lengthen the preceding vowel, as in manầnsi from manas ( $n$. the mind), balîni from balin (n. strong), \&c. This final $i$ is probably a weakened form of an older $a$, and was obviously introduced in Sanskrit after the other Indo-European languages had separated from the parent stock. In the Vedas we find for the acc. pl. terminations - $\hat{a} n i$, $-\hat{\imath} n i$, and $-\hat{u} n i,-\hat{a},-\hat{\imath}$, and $-\hat{u}$, as in vanâ for vanâni from vana (n. a wood), vis'vâ for vis'vâni from vis'va (n. all), vârî for vârini from vâri (n. water), purû for purûni from puru (n. much). $\ddagger \quad \operatorname{Vanâ}$ and vis'vâare formations similar to Gr . кака́ and L. bona, where the final $a$ was originally long; but in pur $\hat{u}$ for puru- $a$, and vâr̂ for vâri-a, the final $a$ has been assimilated to the preceding vowels, whereas in Greek and Latin this is never done, as in Gr. 'ípıa, yoüva for $\gamma$ ovva, L. maria, pecua.
II. Greek Acc. Pl. This case was formed by adding $s$ to

[^88]the acc. sing., but the full termination $-\nu \varsigma$ was only kept in the Argive and Cretan dialects ; when $\nu$ was lost, the preceding vowel was originally lengthened in compensation, traces of which still remain ; thus we have $i \chi \theta \dot{v}-a s$ and $i \chi \theta \bar{v} s=$ $i \chi \theta \breve{v} \nu s$ from $i \chi \theta \breve{v}$ ( m. ; compare acc. sing. í $\chi$ ण́va and $i \chi \theta \dot{v} \nu$ ), $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon i \varsigma=\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon \mathrm{F}-\mathrm{as}$, from $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa v(\mathrm{~m}$.$) , \pi$ о́ $\varepsilon_{\varepsilon \iota \varsigma}=\pi о \lambda \varepsilon y$-as beside $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota-a \varsigma, \pi o ́ \lambda \eta-a \varsigma$, and $\pi o ́ \lambda i \varsigma=\pi o \lambda \breve{\iota} \varphi$ from $\pi o \lambda \breve{\imath}$ (f.), \&c.
 $\gamma_{\varepsilon v \tau} \alpha \dot{\nu}=\pi \rho \varepsilon \sigma \beta \varepsilon v \tau \alpha ́ \varsigma$. In Lesbian -ovs and -avs became -ots and -aıs, just as we find in the same dialect, $\tau a ́ \lambda a \iota s=\tau a ́ \lambda a \nu s$

 Doric oovs became $\omega$ s, as $i \pi \pi \omega s=i \pi \pi o u s$. The acc. pl. neuter is formed by adding $a$ to the stem, as in $\phi \varepsilon \rho \circ \nu \tau-a, \gamma^{\ell} \nu \eta$

III. Latin Acc. Pl. In masculine and feminine stems this case always ends in $-s$, the vowel preceding which is always long, the consonantal stems, as usual, assuming the form of those in $-i$ : thus we have leg-ès, ferent-ēs, patrēs, artūs =artu$n s$ from artu (m.), turreis, turrīs, and turrēs from turri (f.), bono-s from bono (m.), bona-s from bona (f.). With such forms as turreis, fineis, tristeis, compare Gr. módeıs, and with turrīs, $i g n i \bar{s}$, hostīs, compare Gr. $\pi$ ó $\lambda i s$. The acc. pl. neuter is formed by adding $-a$, as cornu-a, corpor-a for corpos-a, bona for bon $\bar{a}=$ bona- $a$, \&c. Participial stems in -nt assume $i$ before adding $a$, as ferentia from ferent, amantia from amant, \&c.; yet silenta from silent occurs. In Oscan we find -ss for -ns, $n$ being assimilated to $s$, as in via-ss = L. vias for via-ns, \&c. In Umbrian the acc. pl. ends in $f$, as in O. U. avēf, avīf, N. U. avī $f$, aveif $=\mathrm{L} . a v e \bar{s}$, avīs, aveis, O. U. apruf, N. U. aprof $=\mathrm{L} . a p r o s$, \&c. No satisfactory explanation has as yet been suggested for this $f$ : some writers consider it to be the remains of a postposition before which final $s$ has disappeared, in which case avef would be for aves-f; others connect it with I. E. -bhi, which is used to form some other cases, but this expla-
nation is just as improbable as the preceding one. It is more likely that $f$ arose merely from a provincial pronunciation of the original $s$, and $s$ may have become $f$ in Umbrian, just as -as passed through the stage $-a f$ in becoming -ô in Sanskrit (consult §. 34).

## §. 133. The Accusative Dual.

This case has the same termination as the nom. dual.
I. Sanskrit Acc. Dual. The masc. and fem. acc. dual, being the same as the nom. dual, has been already noticed under that case. Neuters have as their ending $\hat{i}$-, which is merely the lengthening of the nom. pl. neuter sign $-\tau$, as $b a-$ lin-l from balin ( n . strong), vâri- $n-\imath$ from vâri (n. water), madhu-n-乞̂ from madhu (n.), sivê = s'iva $+\hat{\imath}$ from siva (n.).
II. Greek Acc. Dual. This case has the same termination as the nom. dual. Greek differs from Sanskrit in having the same termination in the three genders, as кópaк-в from корак (m.), $\phi \lambda \hat{\xi} \beta-\varepsilon$ from $\phi \lambda_{\varepsilon} \beta$ (f.), $\sigma \omega \mu \mu \pi-\varepsilon$ from $\sigma \omega \mu a$ (n.), $\lambda o^{\prime} \gamma \omega$ from $\lambda_{0 \gamma o}\left(\mathrm{~m}\right.$.), vo' $\sigma \omega$ from voro (f.), $\varepsilon_{v}^{\prime} \lambda \omega$ from $\xi v \lambda_{o}$ ( n .), \&c.
III. Latin Acc. Dual. In duo and ambo the acc. masc. is either $d u o$ and $a m b o$, or duo-s and ambo-s, following the analogy of the plural. The feminine is formed only as a plural, nom. duue, amber, acc. dua-s, amba-s. In vulgar Latin dua was used for the neuter beside duo.

## §. 134. The Instrumental Singular.

In Indo-European two forms of the instr. sing. existed, one ending in $-\hat{a}$, and another in -bhi. Now, as the instrumental has two meanings, the one comitative, and the other instrumental proper,* it is likely that each of the above terminations was limited to one special meaning, although finally this limitation was lost. The termination $-\hat{a}$ is perhaps con-

[^89]nected with the pronominal root $a$, of which it is the guna: bli has been connected by some writers with the preposition Skr. $a b h i=$ Gr. $\dot{\alpha} \mu \phi \dot{i}$; but then how is $a b h i$ itself to be explained? It is generally supposed to be the instrumental of the pronominal root $a$. Besides, if bli be of prepositional origin, how are the terminations -bly-as, bly-âm, to be accounted for? Such forms as Skr. vâg-bly-as cannot be compared to such as L . vobiscum, for in the latter the preposition comes last; they would rather require vo-cum-bis as a parallel case. Curtius* suggests that $-b h i$ is connected with the root bhu (to be); from $b h u$ was formed the nominal stem bhu-ya, whence came bhya, and finally $b h i$. Bhuya and consequently $b h i$ in this view meant existence, and being added to another nominal stem expressed coexistence ; hence we have the comitative instrumental.
I. Sanskrit Instr. Sing. In consonantal stems and feminine ones ending in $-i,-\hat{\imath},-u$, and $-\hat{u}$, this case is formed by simply adding - $\hat{a}$, as in $v a k^{\prime}-\hat{a}$ from $v a \hat{k} k^{\prime}(f$.$) , marut- \hat{d}$ from $m a-$ $r u t$ (m.), nady- $\hat{a}$ from nad̂̂̀ (f.), dhênv- $\hat{a}$ from dhênu (f.), \&c. Feminine stems in - $\hat{a}$ alter the stem-vowel to $-\hat{e}$ before adding $-\hat{a}$; hence we have s'ivay- $\hat{a}$ from s'ivâ, \&c. In Vedic, however, we find such forms as $d h \hat{a} r \hat{a}(=d h a ̂ r \hat{a}-\hat{a})$ for dhâray- $\hat{a}$ from dhârâ (f. a shower), \&c. Masculine and neuter stems ending in $-i$ and $-u$ insert $n$, as in bhânunâ from bhânu (m. the sun), vârinâ from:vâri ( n . water), \&c. In the Vedas we find other forms of this case without $n$, as pas vâ from pas'u (m. cattle), madlua from madlu (n. honey); also with guna, as prabâhavâ from prabâhu from bâhu (m. the arm); and also with euphonic $y$, as uruyâ from uru (great). Even in later Sanskrit we find patyâ from pati (m. a master), and sakhŷ̂

* Consult Curtius "zur Chronologie," \&c., p. 257. Bhi appears to be connected with other suffixes beginning with $b h$, as Skr. $-b h a=G \mathrm{Gr}$. $-\phi 0$ in karabha-s, karam-bha-s, Gr. $\begin{gathered}\lambda \lambda \alpha-\phi o-\varsigma, ~ \sigma \tau \varepsilon \\ \varepsilon\end{gathered}-\phi o-\varsigma$, \&cc. As Curtius connects $b h i$ with R. $b h u$, so he connects the Greek suffixes $-\theta a,-\theta l,-\theta \varepsilon \nu$, with the I. E. $d h a$ (to place), whence perhaps also the suffix $-\theta 0$ in $\mu \iota \sigma-\theta o-s$ (from R. $\mu \varepsilon \delta$ ), \&c.
from sakhi (m. a friend). Masculine and neuter stems in -a also insert $n$, but change the stem-vowel into $\hat{e}$, and shorten the final $\hat{a}$, as s'ivêna from s'iva (m. n.), \&c. In the Vedas we find the final $\hat{a}$ sometimes retained, as in kulis'ênâ from kulis'a (m.n. an axe); also without the euphonic $n$, as mahitvâ from mahitva (n. greatness); and also with an euphonic $y$, as svapnayâ from svapna (m. sleep).

The other instrumental termination, -bhi, does not occur in Sanskrit, unless the preposition $a b h i$ be the instr. of the pronominal root $a$. It is, however, much more probable that $a b h i$ was originally a locative, meaning " on both sides of;" compare Skr. abhitas, which still retains this sense.
II. Greek Instr. Sing. The form ending in $-\hat{a}$ appears probably in the adverbial forms, ${ }_{u} \mu a ̆$, Dor. $\dot{a} \mu \tilde{a}$, $\delta i ́ \chi a$, Dor. $\delta \iota \chi \tilde{a}$, $\tau \dot{\alpha} \chi a, \pi \tilde{\eta}, \phi \dot{\eta}$ (found in Il. 2, 144; 14, 499, perhaps for $\sigma \phi \eta=$ Goth. svê, as), ả $\lambda \lambda a \chi \tilde{\eta}, \delta \dot{\eta}$ (for $d y \hat{a}=y \hat{a}$, from pronominal stem $y a$, whence we have the locative form in L. jam), $\pi a ́ \nu \tau \eta$, Dor. $\pi a v \tau \tilde{a}, \& c$. "I $\nu a$ may be the instr. of pronominal stem $i=I$. E. ya, with $\nu$ inserted, as in $\tau \iota \nu o ́ s$ from $\tau i-s$.

The other instrumental ending, $-\phi \iota$, is used also in an ablative and locative signification. It is an instrumental proper in
 ขоцє́ข $\eta \phi$, \&c.
III. Latin Instr. Sing. Neither form of the instr. is found in Latin or any other Italic language.

## §. 135. The Instrumental Plural.

In Indo-European this case ended in -bhis, the plural form of the sing -bhi.
I. Sanskrit Instr. Pl. Marudbhis from marut (m.), kavibhis from kavi (m.), s'ivâbhis from s'ivâ (f.), \&c. Masculine and neuter stems in $-a$ change the stem-vowel into $\hat{e}$ in Vedic, as in as'vébhis from as'va (m.) ; whereas in ordinary Sanskrit $a$ becomes $\hat{a}$, and $b h$ is thrown out, as in s'ivais from s'iva ( m . n.). The oldest form of the instr. of the $\breve{a}$-stems ended in
-âbhis, as we see from the pronominal instr. forms asmâbhis and yushmâbhis, from asma and yushma. The Prâkrit instr. pl. of the $\breve{a}$-stems ends in -êhiin = Ved. -êbhis, as in kusumêhin $=$ Ved. kusumêbhis beside Skr. kusumâis from kusuma (n. a flower). In Old Persian this case in these stems ends in -aibhish = Ved. -êbhis.
II. Greek Instr. Pl. The final $s$ was lost, and consequently the form of the instr. pl. is the same as that of the instr. sing.; i. e. - $\phi \iota$ or $-\phi \iota \nu$, as in $\nu a \tilde{v} \phi \iota \nu$ (II. 2, 794). The form - $\phi \iota \nu$ probably belonged originally to the dual, and corresponded to Skr. -bhyâm.
III. Latin Instr. Pl. There is no trace of this case in Latin or the other Italic languages.

## §. 136. The Instrumental Dual.

See the section on the dative plural, which is identical in form with this case.

## §. 137. The Dative Singular.

In Indo-European this case was formed by adding -ai to the stem. The origin of this termination is very doubtful. Some writers consider it to be the guna of the locative termination $-i$; others derive it from the preposition $a b h i, b h$ being lost, as in Skr. s'ivâis, instr. pl. of s'iva (m. n.), \&c., and in Lith. vilkais (for vilkamis) instr. pl. of vilka, \&c., and as $\phi$ is lost in Doric é $\mu i \nu=$ Skr. mahyam for mabhyam, and Homeric $\tau \varepsilon i v=$ Skr. tubhyam. Bh also appears in these pronominal datives; and as the pronouns generally preserve more archaic forms than the noun, it is likely that here also they point back to the oldest form of the dative. We may compare with this use of $a b h i$ to form the dative the use of the Latin preposition $a d$ to express the dative idea in the expression te ad carnuficem dabo, which occurs in Plautus. Bopp identifies é, the termination of the Sanskrit dative, with the demonstrative stem $\hat{e}$, whence $a y-a m=\hat{\varepsilon}+a m$, and which $\hat{e}$ he considers to be only another form of the stem $\breve{a}$.
I. Sanskrit Dative Sing. The dative of the consonantal stems is formed by the addition of $-\hat{e}$, as marut-ê from marut, \&c. Polysyllabic feminine stems in $-\hat{\imath}$ and $-\hat{\imath}$ form the dative by adding $\hat{a} i$, while monosyllabic feminines in $-\hat{\imath}$ and $-\hat{u}$, and all feminines in $-i$ and $-u$ may form this case in either $-\hat{e}$ or $-\hat{a} i$. All masculine and feminine stems in $-i$ and $-u$ gunate the final vowel before -ê, as gatay-ê from gati (f. motion), bhânav-ê from bhânu (m. the sun), \&cc. Neuter stems in $-i$ and $-u$ insert $n$, as vâri-n-ê from vâri, \&c. Masculines and neuters in -ă add -aya, as s'ivâya from s'iva, \&c., while feminines in $-\hat{a}$ add $-y \hat{a} i$, as sivâyâi from s'ivâ, \&c.
II. Greek Dative Sing. The true dative termination in Greek is only found in stems ending in $-a(a, \eta, o)$ : thus we have oı́кч $=$ o七ко $+o \iota, \theta \varepsilon \tilde{a}=\theta \varepsilon a+a \iota$, \&c. In other stems the locative is used as the dative.

It is a disputed question whether Greek infinitives in -at, - $\mu \varepsilon v a \ell$, - $\varepsilon v a \ell$, -val, are datives of consonantal stems, or locatives of feminine stems in $-\bar{\alpha}$. In favour of the first view we have the analogy of the Sanskrit, in which datives are used as infinitives; and in favour of the second view we have the fact that no Greek dative ends in -at, whereas this termination is found in $\chi a \mu a i$, loc. of St. $\chi a \mu a$. Thus $\lambda \tilde{v} \sigma a l, ~ \tau \varepsilon \theta \nu a ́ \mu \varepsilon \nu a l$, $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{o \iota \pi}$ val, $\delta_{\varepsilon \iota \kappa v}{ }^{2}$ al, may be either datives of the stems $\lambda v-\varsigma$, $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu a-\mu \varepsilon v, \lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{o \iota \pi-\varepsilon \nu}, \delta \varepsilon \iota \kappa-\nu v-\nu$, or locatives of the stems $\lambda v-\sigma a$, $\tau \varepsilon \theta \nu a-\mu \varepsilon \nu a, \lambda_{\varepsilon} \lambda_{o \iota \pi-\varepsilon \nu a,} \delta \varepsilon \iota \kappa-\imath v-\nu a$. The infinitive in $-\sigma \theta a \iota$ is either the dative of a feminine stem in $-i$, corresponding to the Sanskrit dative of stems in -dhi, which is used as an infinitive, as piba-dhyâi (to drink, Rigv. 4, 27, 5), or it has assumed the termination $-\alpha$, , following the analogy of other infinitives.
III. Latin Dative Sing. The dative of cons. stems ends in $-\bar{\imath}$, which probably represents the I. E. -ai. In the fifth century A. U. C. the termination of this case was $-\bar{e}$, as in the Umbrian forms nomn-e = Skr. nâmn-ê, patr-e = Skr. pitr-ê. In the sixth century A. U. C. è became ei, as in Oscan: thus find L. patr-ei, Diov-ei, \&c., beside O. pater-ei, Diuv-ei, \&c. Finally $\bar{e} i$ became $\bar{\imath}$, as in voc- $\bar{\imath}$, \&c. The $u$-stems follow the
analogy of the cons. stems, as in senatu-ei (SC. de Tiburtibus): here also final $e i$ became $\bar{i}$, as in ostentu-i, and at last $-u-i$ became $-\bar{u}$, a change which began early, as in visu (Lucr. 5 , 101), \&c. In the $a$-, $e$-, and $o$ - stems the initial vowel of the termination -ai united itself to the stem vowel, and final $i$ while it remained an independent syllable was long. Thus in the $a$-stems we have terrā-i$($ Enn. Ann. 479) = terra-ai, later terra, \&c. ; final $\bar{\imath}$ sometimes entirely disappeared in early times, as in the datives Matuta, Tuscolana, and similar forms dating from the sixth century, just as in Greek we have $\theta_{\varepsilon} \underset{a}{a}$ for $\theta \varepsilon \tilde{a} u$, \&c. ; $-\vec{a} i$ sometimes became $e$, as in the datives Diane, Victorie, \&c., just as in Umbrian we have the datives $0 . \mathrm{U}$. tute Ikwine $=$ N. U. tote Ijoveine, O. U. ase $=$ L. arce. In Oscan we find the dative ending in $a i$, as in aasai $=\mathrm{L}$. are. In the $e$-stems we have the dative ending in $-\bar{e} \bar{\imath}=-e+e i$, as $f d \bar{d}-i$, spē-i, \&c.; and later in $\cdot \bar{e}, i$ being lost, as $f i d \bar{d}$. The dative of the $o$-stems ended originally in $-\bar{o} i$, as popul $\bar{i} i=$ populo-oi, later populō, $i$ being lost, as in $\mathrm{Gr} . i \pi \pi \psi=i \pi \pi \omega t$, \&c. In Umbrian this dative ended in $e$, as pople $=\mathrm{L}$. populoi, Martie $=\mathrm{L}$. Martioi ; similarly in Volscian we have deve $=\mathrm{L}$. divoi, Declune $=\mathrm{L} . D_{e}$ clunoi. In Oscan $o$-stems this case ends in - $u i^{i}$, as in 0 . O. hurtiui $=$ L. horto, \&c. The Latin infinitive in -re is probably the dative of an abstract noun in -as, just as similar datives are used as infinitives in Sanskrit, as Skr. k'akshas-ê (to see), \&c.: legere would therefore be for legese-final $e$, though originally long, as representing $a i$, being shortened. This shortening of final $e$ is not surprising, as the Romans forgot that the infinitive had been originally a dative ; and moreover, we have an analogous case in the loss of the final $a t$ in Greek infinitives in - $\mu \varepsilon \nu a l$, as ${ }_{\xi}^{\xi} \mu \varepsilon \nu={ }_{\xi}^{\xi} \mu \varepsilon \nu a t$, \&c.

## §. 138. The Dative Plural.

We have already seen that in Sanskrit bhyam $(=b h i+a m)$, is used to form the dative singular of the pronouns, as in tubhyam, mahyam. This termination, with the addition of $s$, was
therefore most probably the original termination of the dative plural in Indo-European. The Old Prussian supplies us with a positive proof that this supposition is correct, as in it the dat. pl. ends in -mans, which represents an I. E. -bhyams. In Lithuanian this case ended in -mus, which also must have arisen from the same form, as the presence of the nasal is shown by $u$; for had the original form been -bhyas, we would have found -mas.
I. Sanskrit Dat. Pl. Here -bhyams becomes -bhyas, as in marud-bhyas, nâubhyas, \&c. Final ă becomes ê, as in s'ivêbhyas from siva (m. n.), \&c.
II. Greek Dat. Pl. The locative plural is used as the dative in Greek.
III. Latin Dat. Pl. Here -bhyams became -beis, and later -bis in the pronouns, as in vobeis, later vobis, \&c.; and -bos (?), and later -bus in the nouns, as in navebos, ovibus, \&c. The consonantal stems add $i$ to the stem, as in fratribus, hominibus, from the stems frater, homin. It is possible that originally in Latin -bus was added immediately to the stem, and perhaps $b \bar{o} b u s$ or $b \bar{u} b u s=b o v-b u s$, is a relic of this stage. In the $i$-stems $i$ in Old Latin became $e$, as in tempestatebus. In the $u$-stems, $u$ sometimes became $i$, as in fructibus. In the $e$-stems -bus only occurs in Classical Latin in diebus and rebus; speciebus is censured by Cicero as not correct. In the o-stems -bus only occurs in duobus and ambobus. In feminine $\bar{a}$ stems -bus often occurs, as in filiäbus, deābus, \&c. The dat. pl. of the $a$ - and $o$-stems ends in -is. Two different explanations have been suggested to explain this termination. Schleicher supposes that equis, for example, arose from equois, and that equois again represents an older equo-hios = equo-fios, in which -fios $=-$ bhyas. This explanation is most improbable, and it is much more likely that here,* as in the Greek dat. pl., we have the old lo-

[^90]cative : silvais, agrois, would then be for silvaisi, agroisi, just
 $i$ is very common in Latin ; thus we have est = Gr. ह̀ $\sigma \tau \hat{\prime}$, tremunt $=$ O. L. tremonti, \&c. The oldest form of the Latin dative, without the addition of $i$ to the stem-vowel, as in mensa- $i-s$, \&c., is found on an inscription (C. I. L. 1, n. 814), where we read devas Corniscas sacrum, where devas and Corniscas correspond to the old Attic datives rauia $\sigma \iota$, ${ }^{\prime \prime} \rho a \sigma \iota$, \&c. That the dative plural of the $a$ - and $o$-stems originally ended in the diphthongs -ais and -ois is proved by the forms noticed by Festus, oloes ( $=$ illis), privicloes ( $=$ priviculis), and by the cognate Italic languages. On an old inscription, perhaps of Latin origin, we find suois and cnatois $=\mathrm{L}$. suis and gnatis. In Oscan we find Nuvlanuirs (m.) = L. Nolanis, ligatuis (m.) $=$ L. legatis, diumpais $(\mathrm{f})=$.L . lymphis. In Umbrian the dat. pl. of the $a$ - and $o$-stems ends in -eis, -es, -is, and in later Umbrian in -eir, -er, -ir ; thus we have O. U. termnes (= L. terminis), O. U. veskles (= L. vasculis), O. U. tekuries $=\mathrm{N}$. U. dequrier $(=\mathrm{L}$. decuriis), O. U. Treplanes $=\mathrm{N}$. U. Treblaneir or Treblanir, N. U. toter (= L. tutis), N. U. alfir (= L. albis), \&c. In the $i$-stems this case ends in -eis, -es, following probably the analogy of the $a$ - and $o$-stems; Schleicher, however, explains this form in the same way as Latin datives in -is, and deduces aves, aveis, from avi-fos, \&c. The dative pl. of the consonantal stems ends in -us, as fratrus (fratribus), dupursus (bipedibus), \&c. Schleicher considers that the oldest form of fratrus was fratr-o-fos, whence came fratrus through the stages fratrufos, fratrufs, fratruss.

## §. 139. The Dative Dual.

This case in Indo-European perhaps ended in -bhyâms, a lengthened form of the pl. -bhyams.
I. Sanskrit Dat. Dual. The I. E. termination here became -bhyâm, as in marud-bhyâm from marut ( m .), s'ivâ-bhyâm from s'iva (m.n.) and siva (f.), \&c. The $\check{a}$-stems lengthen the stemvowel before adding this suffix.
II. Greek Dat. Dual.* The dative and genitive dual have the same form in Greek : -bhyâms first, probably, became - $\phi \iota \nu$, and then $-\iota \nu, \phi$ being lost. Stems ending in $-\iota,-v$, or a consonant, follow the analogy of the $a$-stems: thus we have $\gamma \varepsilon \nu$ coo $\nu$ and $\gamma \varepsilon \nu \circ$ oil $=\gamma \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \sigma-o-\phi \iota \nu, \mu a \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho o \iota \nu=\mu a \tau \varepsilon \rho-о-\phi \iota \nu, \nu \varepsilon \kappa v i o \iota \nu=$ $\nu \varepsilon \kappa v-o-\phi \iota \nu, \gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon ์ \iota \nu \nu=\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon$ F-o- $\phi \iota \nu$ from St. $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa v$ with guna of the stem-vowel, Ion. $\pi 0 \lambda i o t \nu=\pi o \lambda \iota-o-\phi \iota \nu, \pi o \lambda$ 完 $\iota \nu=\pi o \lambda \varepsilon y-$ $0-\phi \iota \nu$ from St. $\pi o \lambda \iota$ with guna of the stem-vowel, $i \pi \pi \pi o l \nu=$

 $\phi$ aюo, \&c., $\iota$ appears to have been added to the stem, and consequently $\tau 0 \pi \iota \iota=\tau 0-\iota-\phi \iota \nu, \& c$. This $\iota$, perhaps, represents an older $a$, by which the $\breve{a}$-stems.were lengthened as in Sanskrit; roït would then be identical with Skr. tâbhyâm (from St. ta) $=t a-a$-bhyâms. It has been suggested that the second $a$ here is not a mere lengthening of the stem, but that it belongs to the termination : consequently the word should be thus divided, ta-abhi-âms, abhi being in this view the preposition. We find in some Greek consonantal stems datives similar to $\tau 0 і ̈ \iota \nu$ thus we have $\pi 0 \delta o u ̈ \iota \nu=\pi 0 \delta-o-\iota-\phi \iota \nu$ from St. $\pi 0 \delta, \Sigma \varepsilon \iota \rho \eta^{\prime}$ $\nu 0 u \nu=\Sigma \varepsilon \iota \rho \eta \nu-o-\iota-\phi \iota \nu$ from St. $\Sigma \varepsilon \iota \rho \eta \nu$.
III. Latin.Dat. Dual. There is no trace of the termination -bhyâms in any Italic language.

## §. 140. The Ablative Case.

In Indo-European this case was formed by adding - $t \dagger$ to the vocalic stems, with gunation of the stem vowel, or -at

* Consult Schleicher, "Compendium," \&c., p. 590; and Leo Meyer, "Gedrängte Vergleichung der griechischen und lateinischen Declination," p. 64.
$\dagger$ As the abl. sing. ends in Zend in $d$ (written $t$ by Schleicher), and in Latin in $d$, it is likely that $d$ was the original form of the case-ending. This $d$ may be connected with the pronouns ad-as (n. that) and id-am ( n . that). Bopp considers that the $d$ in these pronouns is derived from an older $t$, but it is quite possible that here we may have an independent pronominal stem.
with or without this gunation : in consonantal stems -at was simply added. This -t or -at is of pronominal origin, and was probably connected with the pronominal stem ta.*
I. Sanskrit Abl. Sing. The original $t$ only occurs in the $\breve{a}$-stems, as in s'ivât from s'iva (m. n.). Benfey $\dagger$ adduces one ablative of an $u$-stem ending in $-t$, vidyôt from vidyu. In all other stems - $t$ has become $-s$, and the ablative agrees in form with the genitive. The change of final $t$ into $s$ is common in Greek, as in $\tau \varepsilon \tau v \phi o ́ s=\tau \varepsilon \tau \nu \phi о \tau, \& c ., \delta \mu \omega \bar{s}$ for $\delta \mu \omega \tau=$ Skr. samât (abl. of St. sama, similar), \&c. That final -s of the abl. has sprung from $-t$ is proved by the Zend, where we still find the abl. termination $d$ : thus we have Z. patôid (abl. of pati) $=$ Skr. patês $(\mathrm{abl}$. of pati $=\mathrm{Gr} . \pi o \sigma \iota)$, which is found in compounds, beside Z. patôis (gen.) = Skr. patês (gen.).
II. Greek Abl. Sing. The I. E. $t$ is found in Greek adverbs in $-\omega \varsigma$, where final $\sigma=1$. E. $t$, as no Greek word can end in $t$ : moreover, -at has become $-\hat{a} t=-\omega \tau=-\omega \varsigma$, just as in Zend. $\ddagger$ Thus we have $\pi \tilde{\omega} \varsigma$, Ion. $\kappa \tilde{\omega} \varsigma=\mathrm{I}$. E. kvât from $k v a, \pi \dot{\alpha} \nu \tau-\omega \varsigma$ $=\pi a \nu \tau-\omega \tau, \tau a \chi^{\xi}-\omega \varsigma=\tau a \chi^{\xi} \mathrm{F}-\omega \tau, \& c$.
III. Latin Abl. Sing. In Old Latin and Oscan the abl. ends in $\cdot d$, which is lost in Classical Latin and in Umbrian. Thus in Old Latin we find dictator-ed, convention-id, senatu-d, navale-d, mari-d, alto-d, Gnaivo-d, praida-d, sententia-d, \&c. From facilumed, which is found in the S. C. de Bacc., we see that all adverbs in $-e$ are of ablatival origin, and spring from adjectives in -us, $-a$, -um; the adverbial ablative ending in -ed, so as to be distinguished from the masc. and fem. ablatives of the adjective, which ended in -od and -ad. This $\bar{e}$ was originally long, but gradually became short, as the adverbs were words in constant use. In Oscan -d is also found: thus we have

[^91]from $a$-stems, sakarakliu-d (sacello), aragetu- $d=$ L. argento, preivatu-d $=0$. L. preivato-d, sùva-d $=0$. L. sova-d (suâ), ehtra-d = O. L. exstra-d (in S. C. de Bacc., exstrad urbem), Akudunnia-d = L. Aquiloniâ, \&c.; from an $i$-stem, slaagi-d (fine); the $u$-stems follow the analogy of those in $-i$, as cas-tri-d from St. castru, which appears in Latin as an $a$-stem castro; the consonantal stems partly follow the $i$-stems, and partly end in $-u d$, as prcesent-id $=\mathrm{L}$. prcesente, lig-ud $=\mathrm{L}$. lege. The Oscan also supplies us with additional proof that adverbsin -e were originally ablatives ; for we find amprufi-d ( $=$ L. improbe), which is either from an $i$-stem or from an $a$-stem, as L . improbe. Perhaps the stem vowel was lengthened by $a$, as in the Latin adverbs; in the latter case O. -id and L. -ed would both point back to an older -eid $=-$ oid $=-a-i-d=-a-a-d$ or $-a-a-t$. This lengthening of $\breve{a}$-stems by adding $\breve{a}$ is, as we have already seen, of frequent occurrence in Sanskrit. In Umbrian - $d$ has been lost, as in the $a$-stems, puplu $=0$. L. poplod (populo), vinu $=$ O. L. veinod (vino), termnu $=$ L.termino, mefa $=$ L. mediâ, tuta $=0$. touta-d, mestru $=\mathrm{L}$. magistro, \&. . ; in the $i$-stems, $u k r i, \& c . ;$ in the $u$-stems, which, however, as in Oscan, follow the analogy of the $i$-stems, as mani $=\mathrm{L} . \operatorname{manu}$, \&c.; in the consonantal stems, as kvestur-e $=\mathrm{L}$. quaestore, \&c.*

[^92]§. 141. The Ablative Plural. This case agrees in form with the dat. pl.

## §. 142. The Ablative Dual.

This case agrees in form with.the dat. dual.

## §. 143. The Genitive Singular.

In Indo-European the gen. sing. of the $\breve{a}$-stems ended in $-s y a$, and that of all other stems in $-s$ or -as. The origin of these suffixes has been already discussed in §. 105.
I. Sanskrit Gen. Sing. In consonantal stems and monosyllabic ones ending in any vowel except $\hat{o}$, this case ends in -as, as marut-as from marut (m.), nâv-as from nâu (f.), bliy-as from $b h \hat{\imath}$ (f. fear), \&c. The gen. sing. of monosyllabic stems in $-\hat{\imath}$ and $-\hat{u}$ may also end in - $\hat{a} s$, as bhiy- $\hat{a} s$, \&c. ; stems in - $\dot{a} r$ originally formed their gen. in -as, as we see from the Vedic genitives pitr-as, nar-as, from the stems pitar, nar (m. a man); but in later Sanskrit we find the remarkable forms, pitur, mâtur, dâtur, \&c., as gen.s of the stems pitar, mâtar, dâtâr, \&c. Bopp considers that $-u r$ here arose from $-u r s=-r u s=-$ ras, and consequently that the old form pitras passed through the stages pitrus ( $=$ Gr. $\pi$ arpoós) and piturs in becoming pitur. According to this view the final $r$ is the stem $-r$ transposed; but it is more natural to suppose that the old form pitras became pitrs ( $a$ being lost, and $r$ treated as a vowel), and that from pitrs arose pitus (as this gen. ought properly to be written), $r$ becoming $u$, as is very common in Prâkrit.* The Zend supports the view that these gen.s originally ended in -as: thus we have Z. dathrô (for dathr-as) = Skr. dâtus, Z. nafé-

Indo-European these suffixes had at first a merely locative signification, and that -ta-s marked the direction whither, and -dha-s the place where, the former being from the verbal root $i a$ (to stretch), and the latter from $d h a$ (to place), and the final $s$ coming from the pronominal stem $s a$.

* The form pitus may also be accounted for by supposing that the gen. sing. was originally pitáras ( $=\mathrm{Gr} . \pi a r$ repos), and that this, through the influence of the accent, became, firstly, pitárs. and then pitís.
$d h r o ̂($ euphonically for naptrô) $=$ Skr. naptus, final $-a s$ becoming $\hat{o}$, as usual. In Z. $\hat{a} t h r a s^{\prime}-k^{\prime} a$ (ignisque) we find the gen. still ending in $-a s$, from St. âtar. In Vedic the gen. of the $i-$ and $u$-stems was formed by adding -as directly to the stemvowel, as in pas'v-as from pas'u (m. cattle), madhv-as = Gr. $\mu^{\prime} \theta v$-os from madhu (n. honey), ary-as from ari (m. an enemy), as Gr. $i \delta \rho \iota-o s$ from $i \delta \rho \iota$. We find traces of this formation in later Sanskrit, as in paty-us for paty-as from pati (m. a master), sakhy-us for sakhy-as (m. a friend). The original genitive in -as was supplanted by other forms; and with the exception of Skr. paty-us, and sakhy-us no traces of it are found except in Vedic. Masculine stems in $-i$ and $-u$ gunate the stemvowel, and add $s$, as kavê-s from $k a v i$ (m. a poet), blînô-s from blânu ( m . the sun), \&c. Neuter stems are lengthened by $n$, as vâri-n-as from vâri (n. water), \&c. Feminine stems in $-i$ and $-u$ either follow the analogy of the masc. stems in $-i$ and $-u$, or attach $-\hat{a} s$ directly to stem, while feminine stems in $-\hat{\imath}$ and $-\hat{u}$ can form their genitive only in the latter way: thus we have gatê-s or gaty-âs from gati (f.), but only nady- $\hat{\alpha}$ s from nad $\hat{\imath}$ (f.), \&c. Feminines in $-\hat{a}$ change the stem-vowel into -âi before -âs, as s'ivây-âs from s'ivâ, \&c. Masculines and neuters in - $\breve{a}$ form the gen. by adding -sya, as s'iva-sya from s'iva (m. n.), \&c.; -sya occurs in no other stems except in the pronominal stem $a m u$, the gen. of which is amushya.
II. Greek Gen. Sing. In consonantal stems this case is formed by adding -os to the stem, as in $\pi o \delta-o \rho_{\varsigma}, \mu$ évovs $=\mu \varepsilon^{-}$

 $\Gamma o ́ \rho \gamma \omega \varsigma)=\Gamma o \rho \gamma o v-o s, \pi a \tau \rho-o ́ s$ and $\pi a \tau \varepsilon \rho-o \varsigma$, \&c. The gen. of stems ending in a diphthong, or $\iota$ or $v$, is formed in a similar way, as vaF-ós, $\beta$ oF-ós, vi $\beta_{\rho} \rho t-o s, ~ a ̀ \chi \lambda u ́-o s, ~ \gamma o v \nu o ́ s ~=~ \gamma o v v-o s, ~$ סov@ós $=\delta o \rho v-o s, \& c$ : : the stem-vowels $\iota$ and $v$ can also be gunated before -os, as $\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon-\omega \varsigma,{ }^{*} \pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon-o s$, and Hom. $\pi o ́ \lambda \eta$-os

[^93]$=\pi o \lambda \varepsilon y-o s$, beside Ion. $\pi o ́ \lambda \iota-o s$, Hom. $\mu a ́ \nu \tau \eta-o s=\mu a \nu \tau \varepsilon y-o s$,
 $\pi o \lambda v$. In feminine $a$-stems the gen. sign -as was immediately added to the stem-vowel, as in oo申iās, $\phi v \gamma \bar{\eta} s$. The gen. of the masculine and neuter $a$-stems ended originally in $-\sigma y 0$; the Hom. gen. $s$ in $-o \iota o$ and -oo are derived at once from
 ayo. The ordinary gen. in -ov, Æol. - $\omega$, arises from -oo simply by contraction. The Hom. gen. in -ao is probably derived from an older form in $-a-\sigma y o$, as in 'At $\rho \varepsilon$ ídōo, \&c.; $-\bar{a} o$ sometimes become $-\omega$, as in Aivei $i \omega$, \&c.; and final -o is sometimes lost, as in the Æ્l. 'Aî́oa, K $\rho o v i ́ \delta a, \& c$. In the Arcadian dialect -ao becomes - $\alpha v$, as in 'A $\pi o \lambda \lambda \omega \nu i ́ \delta a v, ~ " E a v$, \&c. Curtius* deduces the gen. ending $-a o$ from $-a o s=$ Skr. - $\hat{a} y \hat{a} s$, but the former explanation is much more probable. Such genitives as mointov, mo入írov, \&c., are derived from
 Thessalian dialect $\dagger$ the gen. sing. of the o-stems frequently ended in -ot. Ahrens considers, and rightly I believe, that this oo represents the older -oto, final o being merely lost, as in gens. in $\bar{a}$. In opposition to this view it has been suggested that this gen. in -ot is properly an old locative, which is here used in the genitive signification, just as in Latin the gen. in $-i$ is supposed to have been also originally a locative.
III. Latin Gen. Sing.-The I. E. gen. suffix -as appears in Latin in the forms -os, -us, -is, -es. The gen. of consonantal stems is formed by adding the suffix immediately to the stem : thus we have ped-is, gener-is for genes-is, nomin-is, patr$i s, \& c$. The I. E. -as in becoming -is first became -os (which is found in the $u$-stems), and then -us (which is found on inscriptions up to the middle of the seventh century A. U. C.

* Curtius, "Grundzüge der griechischen Etymologie," p. 646.
† Ahrens, "De Dialectis Eolicis," \&c., p. 221 ; and "De Dialecto Dorica," p. 528, seq.
in homin-us, Vener-us, Cerer-us, patr-us, \&c.). In Old Latin we also find the gen. of consonantal stems ending in -es, as in Salut-es, Apolon-es, Cerer-es. In late Latin this gen. in -es again appears as in the gens. Ccesar-es, campestr-es. This -es either arose from - $i s$, or else preceded it, the I. E. -as becoming first -es, and then -is; or perhaps we can detect here the influence of the $i$-stems, and $-\bar{e} s$ may be equal to -eis or $-\bar{\imath} s$. Final $s$ was often lost in old and vulgar Latin, as in Casar-u (C.I. L. 1, n. 696), Palcestrion-i (Pl. Mil. Glor. 387), \&c.; and in many cases, where it was written, it was not pronounced, as in miliť̌s qui amicam (Pl. Bacch. 574), \&c.* As the gen. of the $i$-stems ends in classical Latin is - $\check{\text { s }}$, it agrees in form with that of the cons. stems; thus ovis, piscis, \&c., would have had the same form, if they had been derived from the stems ov, pisc, \&c. But this gen. ending -זs was perhaps originally long ( $-\bar{\tau} s$ ), and arose from $-i$-os, just as alis =alios. The close connexion of the consonantal stems with those in $-i$ is shown by the gen. form part-us (Tab. Bant.), from St. part beside parti-s from St. parti. The gen. of the $u$-stems was formed by adding -os to the gunated stem; thus, senatu-os (S. C. de Bacc.) = senatov-os, magistratu-os, \&c.; -os afterwards became -us, as in domu-us, exercitu-us, conventu-us (all on inscriptions); and from -u-us, by contraction, arose the usual gen. in $-\bar{u} s$, and in Old Latin $-\bar{u}$, final $s$ being lost. Beside these gens. in $-u-o s,-u-u s,-\bar{u} s$, we also find another form in $-u$-is in use up to Cicero's time, as in senatu-is, domu-is, \&c., cited by Gellius, anu-is (Ennius), metu-is (Cicero), \&c.: su-is and gru-is always kept this form. The $u$-stems are also declined like those in -0 , as gen. sumpti beside sumptus, quœesti beside qucestu-is (Ter. Hec. 735), and qucestus, senati, gemiti, geli, \&c. The gen. of neuter $u$-stems followed the analogy of the masculine, as cornu-is, cornūs, and cornū (final $s$ being lost, as in gen. senatu, C. I. L. 1, n. 1166),

[^94]from St. cornu. The gen. of the $o$-stems, masc. and neut., ends in $\bar{\imath}$, in late Latin -ei. Three different ways of explaining this form have been suggested: one is, that this case is really the locative, which has here supplanted the old genitive ; another is, that we find here a trace of the termination -asya, e. g. agri $=$ agroi $=$ agro-sya; the last is, that the gen. originally ended in $-0-i s$, e. g. agri $=$ agro-is. This last explanation is much the most likely, for in Umbrian and Oscan the final $s$ is still retained; thus we have O .0. siveis $=\mathrm{L}$. sui, O. O. Pumpaiia-neis = L. Pompeiani; O. U. puples, puple, and N. U. popler $=\mathrm{L}$. populi; O. U. katles and katle $=\mathrm{L}$. catuli, \&c. These forms point back to an Italic gen. in -ois, whence came O. O. -eis, O. U. - $\bar{e} s,-\bar{e}$, and L. $-i$, final $s$ being lost. This -ois may be explained in three different ways : either the stem was lengthened by $y(=i)$, and -as added, as to the consonantal stems, agrois representing therefore an older agra-y-as; or the analogy of the $i$-stems was followed here, and -is added directly to the stem; or, more simply, as was added to the stem without the intervention of $y$, and, consequently, $-0-i s$ $=-a-i s=-a-a s$. Final $i$, though essentially long, was sometimes shortened by Plautus; and disappeared in Noepor for Neei (= Gincevi), por and Marpor = Marcipor. The gen. sing. of the fem. $\bar{a}$-stems ended originally in - $\hat{s}$, as terras (Næv.), vias (Enn.), fortunas (Næv.), \&c.; the same ending is found in O. eituas (pecuniæ), O. miltas (= L. mulcte), U. tutas, \&c.; in classical Latin it is still found in (pater-, mater-) familias. The gen. sing. of these stems also ends in - $\bar{a} \bar{l}$ (in Ennius, Plautus, Lucretius, \&c.), later -a. This $-\bar{a} \bar{\imath}$ arose perhaps from -ais =-ay-as, the stem being lengthened by $y(=i)$; -ais is found in the gen. Prosepnais (C. I. L. 1, p. 554) $=$ Proserpince, and it appears as -es in Faustes, Diances, Lepidas, \&c. This form in ces belonged entirely to vulgar Latin, and is not found before the seventh century A. U. C. It penetrated even into the masc. $a$-stems, as in Messalas, Midas. We may also explain the form -ais in the same way as we ex-
plained the masc. -ois, without supposing the stem to be lengthened by $y$ : thus, by adding -as directly to the stem we get, on the one hand, $-\bar{a}-i s=-\bar{a}-a s$, the second $a$ being weakened to $i$ to diminish the weight of the termination, as in -o-is $=-\breve{a}-a s$, while on the other hand we obtain by simple contraction the other form of the gen. $-\bar{a} s=-\bar{a}-a s$. A third explanation has been suggested: it is supposed that the $\bar{a}$-stems formed their gen.by adding -sya, following the analogy of those in $-\breve{a}$, and that consequently $-\bar{a} \bar{\imath}=-\bar{a}-s y a$; but this theory is extremely improbable, for no trace of the I. E. sya is found in the corresponding Oscan and Umbrian stems. The gen. of the $e$ stems is formed similarly to that of those in $-\bar{a}$ : thus corresponding to the gen. in $-\bar{\alpha} s$, we find the gen. in - $\bar{e} s$, as rabies (Lucret.), fides (Plaut.), dies (Enn.), \&c.; this gen. perhaps appears in Diespiter (the father of day). Corresponding also to the gen. in $-\bar{a} \bar{l}$, we find the gen. in $-\bar{e}$, later $-\bar{e} \bar{\imath}$, except when immediately preceded by a vowel; and then still later corresponding to $-a e$, we find -ei contracted into a diphthong: thus we have fidēi (Enn.), rē̄ (Plaut.), \&c.; then rĕ̄̄ (Pl.), fiděi, \&c.; but always aciēe ; then in the Comedians, rei, spei, are frequently monosyllables. The gen. of the $e$-stems also ends in $\bar{e}$, which may be derived either from $-\bar{e} s, s$ being lost; or from -ei, $i$ being lost; as perniciè, fidè, aciē, diē. Finally, we find a gen. in $-i$ after the analogy of the $o$ - and $u$ - stems, as fami (Cato), plebi (Tab. Bant.); and even when $i$ immediately precedes, as in pernicii (Cic. according to Gellius), progenii (Pacuv.), \&c., where we might have expected final $e$ to be retained to avoid the conjunction of two $i$ : $:$ this $i$ evidently arose from the diphthongisation of the original $-\overline{e r}$, as in the monosyllabic rei. In Oscan the gen. of the consonantal stems is formed by adding -eis, as Juv-eis = L. Jovis, maatreis $=\mathrm{L}$. matris. The gen. of the $i$-stems also ends in eeis, as Herentateis, from St. Herentati, Liwkanatees from St. Livvkanati. We find only one example of an $u$-stem, viz., castrous from St. castru; here $-s$ appears to have been simply added to the gunated stem, as in Sanskrit. We have already noticed
the Oscan and Umbrian $a$-stems. In Umbrian the consonantal stems form their gen. in -es, N. U. -er, following the analogy of the $i$-stems, as N. U. nomn-er from St. nomn beside N. U. ocrer from St. ocri. In the $u$-stems we find $o$ instead of the old $u$, as in N. U. trifo-r (from St. trifu) $=\mathrm{L}$. tribu-s.

## §. 144. The Genitive Plural.

The oldest form of the termination of the gen. pl. in IndoEuropean was probably -as-am-s, -as being the sign of the gen. sing., -am the pronominal element which is found in $-b / i-a m, \& c .$, and $-s$ the sign of the plural. From -asams came first -as $\hat{a} m$, then -sâm, and finally - $\hat{a} m$. We find traces of the first of these forms in the Sanskrit pronominal declension, as têshâm (horum) $=t a$ - $\hat{\text { s }}$ sam from St. $t a$ (hic), yêshâm (quorum) = ya-âsam from St. ya (qui), \&c.; and in the Latin $o$-stems, as equōrum (from St. equŏ) = I. E. akva-asâm (from St. akva), \&c.
I. Sanskrit Gen. Pl. The gen. ending -sâm is only found in the pronominal declension: in the nominal declension this case was formed by attaching - $\hat{a} m$ immediately to stems ending in a consonant or diphthong, as marut- $\hat{a} m$, manas- $\hat{a} m$, bharat- $\hat{a} m, n \hat{a} v-\hat{a} m, ~ \& c ., ~ f r o m ~ t h e ~ s t e m s ~ m a r u t ~(m),. ~ m a n a s ~(n),$. bharant (m.), nâu (f.): \&c. Pollysyllabic vocalic stems lengthen the stem by $n$, as in gatî-nâm, vârî-nâm, sivâ-nâm, nadî-nâm, \&c., from the stems gati (f.), vâri (n.), s'iva (m. n.), $n a d \hat{\imath}$ (f.), \&c.: short stem-vowels are always lengthened before this $n$. Monosyllabic feminine stems in $\hat{\imath}$ and $\hat{\imath}$ may either add $n$ or not ; thus from $b h \hat{\imath}$ (f.) we have bhiy-âm, or bhî-nâm, \&c. Stems in -ar form their gen. pl. from the weak stem in -r, and add $n$, as pitr̂-n̂̂m, mâtṛ̂-nam, dât $\hat{r}$-nam, \&c., from the stems pitar, mâtar, dâtâr, \&c. In Vedic we find older forms of these genitives without $n$, as dêvâm from St. dêva (m. a god), nar-âm, svasr-âm from stems nar (m. a man), svasâr (f. a sister).
II. Greek Gen. Pl. This case is formed by adding - $\omega v$ to all stems, except those ending in $-\bar{a}$; $\mathfrak{l}$ and $\boldsymbol{v}$ - stems are
sometimes gunated. Thus we have $\pi o \delta-\bar{\omega} \nu, \delta \varepsilon \pi a ́-\omega \nu=\delta \varepsilon \pi a \sigma-$ $\omega \nu, \sigma \tau \eta \eta^{\tilde{\omega}} \nu \mathrm{\nu}$ and $\sigma \tau \eta \theta \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \nu=\sigma \tau \eta \theta_{\varepsilon \sigma-\omega \nu,} \mu a k a ́ \rho-\omega \nu, \nu \alpha \mathrm{F}-\tilde{\omega} \nu, \beta a-$ $\sigma_{l} \lambda_{\eta}^{\prime}-\omega \nu=\beta a \sigma \iota \lambda_{E} F-\omega \nu, \sigma v-\tilde{\omega} \nu, \gamma^{\varepsilon v} \dot{v}-\omega \nu, \quad \gamma^{\circ} \dot{v} \nu-\omega \nu=\gamma o v v-\omega \nu$, $\pi o \lambda \omega \nu \nu$ and $\pi o \lambda \hat{\varepsilon}-\omega \nu=\pi o \lambda_{\xi} \mathrm{F}-\omega \nu$ from St. $\pi o \lambda \nu$ gunated, $\pi o \lambda i-$
 $=\vec{a} \gamma \rho o-\omega \nu, \chi \omega \rho \tilde{\omega} \nu=\chi \omega \rho \bar{a}-\sigma \omega v$. The gen: pl. of the $\bar{\alpha}$-stems generally ends in Homer in $-\bar{a}-\omega \nu=-\hat{a}$-sâm; thus we find $\theta_{\varepsilon} \overline{\bar{a}}-\omega \nu=\theta_{\varepsilon} \tilde{a}-\sigma \omega \nu$ from St. $\theta_{\varepsilon} \bar{a}, \tau \bar{a}-\omega \nu=\tau \bar{a}-\sigma \omega \nu=$ Skr. $t \hat{\alpha}-s \hat{a} m$ from St. $t a$, \&c. This $-\bar{a}-\omega \nu$ became $-\varepsilon-\omega \nu$ in Ionic.
III. Latin Gen. Pl. This case is formed by adding -um, O. L. -om (found in the $u$-stems and in the $o$-stems after $v$ or $u$ ), to stems ending in a consonant or $-i$ or $-u$. Thus we have princip-um, fulmin-um, can-um, matr-um, \&c.; avi-um, ovi-um, \&c.; magistratu-om perhaps for magistratov-om, fructu-um, \&c.; and with $-u-u m$ contracted, as in passum (Pl.), currum (Virg.), but in vulgar Latin also after the analogy of the $o$-declension, verso-rum, spirito-rum, \&c. Many consonantal stems are lengthened by $i$, and so their 'gen. pl. termination agrees in form with that of the $i$-stems : thus we have merc- $i-u m$, radic-$i-u m$, forcip-i-um, penat-i-um, amant-i-um beside amant-um, ferent-i-um beside ferent-um, \&c. Stems ending in $-n,-r$, or $-s$, seldom permit this addition of $i$; we find, however, vir- $i-$ $u m$ and complur-i-um. We find some examples of consonantal stems following the analogy of those in $-u$ : thus we have alit-u-um (Lucr. and Virg.) beside alit-um, and on inscriptions virtut-u-um, fratr-u-um, \&c.

The masc. and neut. $o$-stems form their gen. pl. in two ways: by adding either -om (or $-u m$ ) $=\mathrm{I}$. E. $-\hat{a} m$ or - orrum = I. E. -asâm. Thus we find in Old Latin the forms in -om, Romanom (C. I. L. 1, n. 1), sovom (C. I. L. 1, n. 588) $=$ suorum, divom (Lucr.) \&c.; later in -um, as in virum, deum, meum, nummum, modium, talentum, fabrum, \&c. Similarly in Oscan we find Abellanum, Tiiatium, Nüvlanum, and in Umbrian puplum, later poplom (populorum), \&c. The other gen. pl. ending in -ōrum, (m. n.) and -ärum (f.) is the usual
form, as in bonōrum = bon $\check{\sigma}+\check{\text { rum }}$, bonărum $=b o n \bar{a}+a ̆ r u m, ~ \& c$. In Oscan the gen. pl. of the $\bar{\alpha}$-stems ends in -azum, and in Umbrian in -arum, -aru, as in 0 . eisa-zun-c egma-zum (illarum rerum), U. menzaru $=\mathrm{L}$. mensarum, \&c. The $\bar{e}$-stems follow the analogy of the $\bar{a}$-stems, as dierum, rerum, \&c. Masc. stems in $-a$ form their gen. pl. in -rum, but in the poets we find the form in -um in compounds of -gena and -cola, and in the patronymics in -des, as agricolum, terrigenum, Aneadum, \&c. Two feminine stems in - $\bar{a}$ form their gen. pl. also in -um-namely, amphorum and drachmum, but these forms were probably borrowed from the Greek. We find other traces of the gen. pl. ending -sum in the forms (noticed by Varro and Charisius) boverum, nucerum, regerum, lapiderum, which are supposed by Bopp to have been formed from the $i$-stems bovi, nuci, regi, lapidi, and consequently to be for bovirum, \&c., thus proving that -rum was also originally attached to the $i$-stems. These forms have been also explained by supposing them to have been formed from the stems bover, nucer, \&c., the original stems bov, nuc, \&c., being lengthened by the addition of er, because this $r$ appears also in some stems in the gen. sing., and consequently is not peculiar to the plural : thus we find sueris, puberis, acipenseris, cucumeris, beside suis, pubis, acipensis, cucumis.*

The Oscan and Umbrian form the gen. pl. of stems ending in $-i$ or a consonant in the same way as the Latin.

## §. 145. The Genitive Dual.

This case agrees in form with the locative dual.

## §. 146. The Locative Singular.

In Indo-European the sign of this case was probably -in, which was added directly to the stem. This -in was connected

[^95]with the pronominal root -am, which was reduced firstly to -an ( $n$ being weaker than $m$ ), and then to -in ( $i$ being weaker than $a$ ). From -an are derived the prepositions, Gr. $\mathfrak{z} v$, L. in. The oldest form ( $-a m$ ) of this suffix is still perhaps found in $-\hat{a} m$, the locative ending of Skr. fem. stems.
I. Sanskrit Loc. Sing. Stems ending in a consonant or diphthong form this case by adding $-i$ to stem, as marut-i, bharat-i, pitar-i, nâv-i, gav-i, from the stems marut, bharat, pitar, nâu, ĝ̂. Masc. stems in $-i$ and $-u$ add $-\hat{a} u$, before which the stem-vowel disappears, as in kavâu, bhânâu, from kavi, bhânu: the stem-vowel is still kept in paty- $\hat{a} u$ and sakhy- $\hat{a} u$ from pati and sakhi. This - $\hat{a} u$ perhaps represents $-\hat{a} m$, the gunated form of $-a m$. Fem. stems in $-i$ and $-u$ either follow the analogy of the masc. in $-i$ and $-u$, or else add $-\hat{a} m$, as $g a t-\hat{a} u$ or gaty-âm from gati. Polysyllabic fem. stems in $-\hat{a},-\hat{\imath}$, or $\hat{u}$, always add -âm, as siviva-y-âm, nâdy-âm, vadhv-âm, from s'ivâ, nad $\hat{\imath}$, vadh $\hat{u}$. Monosyllabic fem. stems in $-\hat{\imath}$ and $-\hat{\imath}$ add either $-i$ or $-\hat{a} m$, as $b h u v-i$ or bhuv- $\hat{a} m$ from bhû. Neuter stems in $-i$ and $-u$ lengthen the stem by $n$, as $v a \hat{a r i}-n-i$ from vâri. Masc. and neut. stems in $-a$ add $-i$, as s'ive from siva (m., n.).

In Vedic we find the loc. of the $u$-stems formed by simply adding -i, as tanv-i (from tanu, f. the body) $=$ Z. tanv-i (loc. of tanu, f. id.); this form corresponds to Gr. dat., as $\nu \in \in \kappa v-\iota$, \&c. We also find in Vedic - $i$ added to the gunated $u$-stem, as sûnav-i (from sûnu, m. a son) $=$ Ch. Sl. sünov- $i$. The loc. of the fem. $\hat{a}$-stems also ends sometimes in $-\hat{e}$ in Vedic. The loc. ending -in is only found in Sanskrit in the pronominal declension, as in ya-sm-in from ya (who), ta-sm-in from ta (that), \&c.
II. Greek Loc. Sing. The Gr. dat. sing., except in the case of the $\check{\bar{a}}$-stems, is properly a loc., being formed simply by the addition of $\iota$ : thus we have $\pi 0 \delta-i, \gamma^{\varepsilon} \rho \rho \nu \tau-\iota, \mu \eta \tau \varepsilon \rho \rho-\iota$,



The loc．meaning is still frequently found，as in $\Delta \omega \delta \bar{\delta} \nu-\iota$ ， Maра立 $\nu-\iota, \Sigma \alpha \lambda \alpha \mu \tilde{\imath} \nu-\iota, \nu v к \tau-i, \& c$ ．

In the $a$－stems we find the loc．and dat．both in existence beside each other，as dat．$\dot{a} \gamma \rho \tilde{\varphi} \tilde{a}=\dot{a} \gamma \rho o+o \iota$ beside loc．oı̀ко $=$ oiкo $+\iota$ ，dat．$\tau \iota \mu \bar{\eta}=\tau \iota \mu \bar{a}+\breve{a} \iota$ beside loc．$\chi \alpha \mu a i=\chi \alpha \mu \dot{a}+\iota$. Xauai is the only example of the loc．of an $\bar{\alpha}$－stem，unless the preposition $\boldsymbol{i} \pi a^{i}(\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi o ́)}$ be the loc．of a stem $\boldsymbol{v} \pi \bar{a}$ ，just as $\dot{\boldsymbol{v} \pi \varepsilon \boldsymbol{i} \rho}$ （ $\dot{v} \pi \varepsilon \rho$ ）appears to be the loc．of a stem $\dot{v} \pi \varepsilon \rho$ ，and to be for $\dot{v} \pi \varepsilon \rho \iota=$ Skr．upari and Z．upairi．Besides oıko七 we find many other examples of locs．of o－stems，as $\Pi \nu \lambda_{0-\iota}$（found in $\Pi v$－

 side $\dot{v} \psi o \vec{v}), \pi o \bar{\imath}=\pi o+\iota$ ，\＆c．In Eolic we frequently find this loc．termination－o－८ becoming $-v-\iota$ ：thus we find $\mu$ ह́天v－ı $=\mu \varepsilon ́ \sigma \sigma-\iota, \tau v i ̋ \delta \varepsilon$（here）for $\tau 0-\iota-\delta \varepsilon, \pi \dot{\eta} \lambda \nu-\iota(\tau \dot{\eta} \lambda \sigma \sigma \varepsilon), a ̆ \lambda \lambda \nu-\iota, \dot{a} \tau \varepsilon \in \rho v-\iota$ （ $\varepsilon \tau \varepsilon ́ \rho о \sigma \varepsilon)=\dot{\varepsilon} \tau \varepsilon \rho о-\iota$ ．In Doric we find－o七 represented by－$\varepsilon$ ，
 Syrac． $\left.\mathfrak{\varepsilon} \xi_{o \iota}\right)$ ．We also find in common Greek this same loc．
 $\kappa \varepsilon i ́, ~ a ́ \mu \iota \sigma \theta \varepsilon i ́, \pi u \nu \sigma \tau \rho a \tau \varepsilon i ́:-\varepsilon \iota$ sometimes became $-\iota$ ，as in à $\mu a \chi i$ i． ＂$A \gamma \chi^{-\iota}$ is perhaps for ${ }^{\circ} \gamma \chi^{\varepsilon-\iota}$ from an $o$－stem ${ }^{\boldsymbol{a}} \gamma \chi \boldsymbol{\chi}$ ，whence $\dot{a} \gamma \chi^{\circ} \bar{u}:$ comp．Hom．$\dot{a} \gamma \chi^{\dot{\varepsilon}-\mu a \chi o s, ~ w h e r e ~} \dot{a} \gamma \chi^{\varepsilon}=\dot{a} \gamma \chi^{\varepsilon-\iota}, \iota$ being lost．＇Aısi may also be the loc．of a stem，aıFo＝Skr．êva ＝L．avo：in Lesbian Eolic this particle appears also in the forms aïiv，äïv，where final $v$ is perhaps the original loc．$n$ ． The datives $\mu 0 i, \quad \sigma o i=$ Dor．$\tau \boldsymbol{i}$, are probably locatives，and correspond to the Skr．loc．s may－i，tvay－i，from the stems ma， tva；may－i being＝ma－i－i＝ma－a－i，the stem being lengthened by $a$ ，and then this $a$ being weakened to $i$ ，and similarly tvayi $=t v a-a-i$ ．

III．Latin Loc．Sing．The locative of the consonantal stems ended in $-\bar{\imath}$ ，later $-\check{e}$ ：the loc．ending was properly $\check{\tau}$ ；but the consonantal stems were lengthened by $i$ ，and so followed the analogy of the $i$－stems，and thus $\bar{\imath}=-\check{\imath}+\check{\imath}$ arose；thus we find loc－ī（Pl．Amph．165），rur－ī（Pl．Most．799），and
rur-e, vesper-i and vesper-e, infelic- $i$, arbor- $i$ (Liv. 1, 26, infelici arbori reste suspendito), her-i for hes-i from hes (= Gr. $\chi \theta_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}$ ) which appears in hes-ternus, Anxur-i, Acherunt- $i$, Si-cyon- $i$, \&c. Mane is the loc. of an $i$-stem, and domu- $i$ of an $u$-stem ; for domu-i we generally find domĩ and dom $\check{\imath}$ after the analogy of the o-stems.* The loc. of the $o$-stems ends in $-i$ (Old Latin also $e i$ and $-e$ ) $=-o-i$, as humi (from St. humo) = humo-i, belli, foci, Ephesi, Corinthi, \&c. This case is also found in postri-die, quoti-die, pri-die; and in Old Latin we find die quinte and die quinti, die septimei, die crastini, \&c. Similarly the loc. of the $a$-stems is formed by adding $-i$, as Roma- $i$, later Romace, militice, \&c. In Oscan the loc. of the $o$ - and $a$-stems is formed in the same way as in Latin : thus we have muinikei terei (in communi agro), tero- being a neuter stem, and esai viai mefiai (in ea via media). The loc $-n$ has nearly disappeared, but it probably still exists in -en (lo !) loc. of St. $i$, and in peren-die, peren being loc. of St. pero $=$ Skr. para (another), which is also found in per-egre, from pero and agro. In Oscan we find this $n$ in hortin Kerriien (in horto Cereali), hortin being probably for hortein from St. horto. In Sabellian we also find it in esmen-ek asin (on this altar), from stems esmo and asa: esmen is identical with Skr. asmin, except that it still retains the stem-vowel, which is lost in Sanskrit. Jam is also supposed to be a loc. from a stem $j a$, and is identified with Skr. yasmin, loc. of $y a$. In Umbrian we find two peculiar locative suffixes, -mem or -me in sing., and -fem or $f e$ in pl. No satisfactory explanation of these forms has as yet been suggested: Aufrecht and Kirchhoff consider that mem and fem were originally identical, $\dagger$ and connected with Skr.

[^96]bhyâm, while Bopp* considers that they arise from a postposition added to the acc.s sing. and pl. In Umbrian we also find traces of a loc. in $-i$, as in 0 . U. sve (if) $=0$. O. $s v a i=$ L. si, O. U. pre = L. proe for pra-i, from a St. pra; N. U. perne (from the front), N. U. postne (from the rear).

## §. 147. The Locative Plural. $\dagger$

Schleicher considers that the original termination of this case in Indo-European was $-s v a-s a,-s v a$ being of pronominal origin, and $s a$ the mark of the plural. From -svasa are derived the Vedic loc. ending -susu, the Zend -shva, -sh $\hat{u}$, $-s h u$, -hva, -hî, -hu, the old Persian -suvâ, the Skr. -su, -shu, and the Gr. $-\sigma \sigma \iota,-\sigma \iota$.
I. Sanskrit Loc. Pl.-This case is formed by adding -su (or $-s h u$ ) to the stem, final $\breve{a}$ becoming $\hat{e}$; thus we have s'ivêshu, sivivâ-su, kavi-shu, marut-su, \&c., from s'iva (m., n.), sivâ (f.), kavi (m.), marut (m.), \&c.
II. Greek Loc. Pl.-This case ends in $-\sigma \sigma \iota$ or $-\sigma \iota$, from $-\sigma F_{l}$, before which stems in $-\bar{a}$ are lengthened by the addition of $i$, as is the case with $\check{a}$-stems in Sanskrit. This $-\sigma \sigma \iota$ or $-\sigma \iota$ is added to some consonantal stems and some ending in $-\iota$ and $-v$, by means of the helping vowel $\varepsilon$ : thus we have $\pi \boldsymbol{\pi} \sigma-\sigma i$ for $\pi \circ \delta \cdot \sigma \iota, \kappa \tau \eta \mu \alpha-\sigma \iota$ for $\kappa \tau \eta \mu a \tau-\sigma \iota, \delta \varepsilon \pi \alpha ́-\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ for $\delta \varepsilon \pi a \sigma-\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota, \beta \varepsilon \lambda \varepsilon$ -

 $\sigma \iota$ and $\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon-\sigma \iota=\pi 0 \lambda \varepsilon y-\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ from $\pi o \lambda \iota, \pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon-\sigma \sigma \iota$ for $\pi o \lambda \varepsilon F-$ $\varepsilon \sigma \sigma \iota$ from $\pi o \lambda v-, ~ i \pi \pi o-\iota-\sigma \iota, \chi^{\omega} \rho \alpha-\iota-\sigma \iota, \& c$. The lengthening of the $\bar{a}$-stems by $i$ was probably much later than that of the $\breve{u}$-stems; for we still find fem. loc.s without this $i$, as $\theta \dot{v} \rho \bar{a}-$ $\sigma \iota,{ }^{\prime} A \theta \dot{\eta} \nu \eta-\sigma \iota, \& c$.
III. Latin Loc. Pl. This case agrees in form with the dat. and abl. pl. A trace of the Indo-European loc. termi-

[^97]nation is supposed by some to be found in the plural ending $-i s$, which is also used for the dat. and abl. in the $a$ - and $o$ declensions : thus we find foris, Athenis, Cumis, Delphis, \&c., all used as locatives.

## §. 148. The Locative Dual.

I. Sanskrit Loc. Dual. This case is formed by adding -ôs to the stem, final $-\check{\bar{a}}$ becoming $-\hat{e}$ and neuter stems in $-i$ and $-u$ being lengthened by $n$ : thus we have marut-ôs, kavyôs, vâri-n-ôos, sivay-ôs, \&c., from marut (m.), kavi (m.), vâri (n.), s'iva (m., n.), and s'iva (f.), \&c.
II. and III. This case is not found in either Greek or Latin.

## §. 149 The Vocative Singular.

The vocative singular consisted of the mere stem in IndoEuropean.
I. Sanskit Voc. Sing. Masc. and fem. stems in $-i$ and $-u$ gunate the stem-vowel in this case, as kavê, dleênô, \&c., from kavi (m.), dhênu (f.), \&c. Polysyllabic fem. stems in $-\hat{\imath}$ and - $\hat{u}$ shorten the stem-vowel, as in nadi, vadhu, from nadî (f.), $v a d h \hat{u}$ (f.) ; fem. stems in $-\hat{a}$ change the stem-vowel into $\hat{e}$, as s'ivê from s'ivâ (f.). Monosyllabic stems ending in a vowel use the nominative for the vocative, as $b h \hat{\imath} s$, nâus, \&c., from $b h \hat{\imath}$ (f.), nâu (f.), \&c. Neuter stems in $-i$ and $-u$ may either gunate the stem-vowel or leave it unchanged, as vâri and rârê from vâri (n.), \&c. Neuter stems in -n may either retain or lose this consonant, as nâma or nâman from nâman (n.), \&c. In all other stems the vocative consists of the mere stem, as s'iva, marut, vâk, \&c., from s'iva (m., n.), marut (m.), vâk (f.), \&c. In all Skr. vocatives the accent is always placed on the first syllable, as nádi, bálin, \&c, from nadí', balin, \&c.
II. Greek Voc. Sing.-In guttural and labial stems the vo-
cative is the same as the nominative, as $\phi \dot{d} \lambda a \xi$, Kúk $\lambda \omega \psi$, \&c.; we find, however, fóvau from $\gamma \mathbf{v} \boldsymbol{v a i k}$. In dental stems the vocative generally is identical with the mere stem, subject to the euphonic laws of the Greek language, as $\pi a i l$ for $\pi a \iota \delta$,
 $\pi$ áres (with accent thrown back as in Skr. Voc. pitar), סvo$\mu \varepsilon \nu \nu_{s}$, \&c.; we find, however, $\pi$ oũg used as the voc.; and in participles ending in -as, $-\varepsilon \iota$, -ovg, and $-\omega \nu$, the voc. is the same as the nom. The voc. of masc. o-stems ends in $-\varepsilon$ generally; but we also find voc. $\theta$ éós (beside $\theta_{\varepsilon \varepsilon} \varepsilon$ $\mu o v, \theta_{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \mu^{\prime} \mu v$, Matth. xxvii., 46), фílos (Od. 3, 375), \&c. Masc. stems in $-\bar{a}(-\eta)$ form the voc. in $a$ and $\eta$, as $\pi$ odïra, K $\rho o-$ $\nu i o ̂ \eta, \& c$. Fem. stems in $-\bar{a}$ form voc. in $\bar{a}$ generally, as $\theta \neq \bar{a}$, коúpä (Æol. кouvpă), \&c.; and this $\vec{a}$ often becomes $\breve{a}$, as in the nom., as $\mu \circ \bar{v} \sigma a, \dot{a} \nu a \sigma \sigma a$. In stems ending in $-t,-v$, or a diphthong, the voc. is the mere stem, as $\mu$ ávit, $\tau a \not \chi^{\prime}, ~ \gamma \rho a \tilde{v}$, \&c. The fem. voc.s in -ot, such as aiठot̃, appear to be related to the nom.s in $-\omega$ as the Skr. voc. of fem. $\hat{a}$-stems is to the nom. ; for $-o \iota(=$ I. E. $-a i):-\omega(=\mathrm{I}$. E. $-\hat{a})::-\hat{e}(=\mathrm{I}$. E. $-a i):-\hat{a}$.
III. Latin Voc. Sing. The voc. in Latin is always the same as the nom., except in the case of the masc. $o$-stems, where it ends in $-e$, as bone, puere ( Pl . Most. 947), from puerus $=$ puer, filie (in Livius Andronicus), and later fili, \&c. So in Umbrian the voc. of the $o$-stems ends in $-e$, as Sançie, \&c.

## §. 150. The Vocatives Plural and Dual.

In Sanskrit and Greek the voc. pl. and the voc. dual are the same as the nom. pl. and the nom. dual, except that in Sanskrit the accent is always placed on the first syllable of the voc. In Latin the nom. pl. and the voc. pl. are the same.
§. 151. Paradigms* of the Nominal Declension.
I. Consonantal Stems.
I.-I. E. vâk- (f.), \&c.

|  | Skr. | Gr. | L. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stem. | $v a ̂ k '-(f$. | ${ }^{6} \boldsymbol{\pi}$ (f.) | vōc- (voc-i, f.) |
| Sing. N. V. | vâk. | \%\% $\pi$-S. | vठ¢-s. |
| A. | vâk'-am. | ö $\pi$ - $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$. | vōc-em. |
| I. | $v a k^{\prime}-\hat{a}$ | - | - |
| D. | $v a k '$-ê. | - | $v \bar{o} c-\bar{z}$. |
| Ab. | $v a ̀ k '-a s$. | - | $v \delta \bar{c}-\bar{e}(d)$. |
| G. | valk'-as. | ótoós. | vōc-is. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | vâk'-i. | ó $\pi$-í. | - |
| Plur. N. V. | vâk'-as. | ö $\pi$ - $\mathrm{\varepsilon}$ ¢ | $\boldsymbol{\nu} \dot{\partial} \boldsymbol{c}-\bar{e} s$. |
| A. | vâk'-as. | ö $\pi$-ac. | vōc-ès. |
| I. | vâg-bhis. | - | - |
| D. Ab . | vâg-bhyas. | - | vōc-i-bus. |
| G. | $v a k k^{\prime}-\hat{a} m$. | $\dot{\delta} \pi-\bar{\omega} \nu$. | vōc-um. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | $v a ̂ k-s h u$. | $\dot{\boldsymbol{o}} \boldsymbol{\pi}-\sigma \boldsymbol{\sigma}$. | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | $v a \hat{k} l^{\prime}-\hat{a} u$. | - | - |
| " | Ved. $v \hat{a} k^{\prime}-\hat{a}$. | ö $\pi$ - $\varepsilon$. | - |
| $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { I. D. Ab. } \\ \text { (Gr. G. D.) } \end{array}\right\}$ | $v a ̂ g-b h y a ̂ m$. |  | - |
| G. L. | $v a k '$-ôs. | - | - |

II.-I. E. bharant- (m., f., n.), \&c.

Skr.
Stem. bharant- (m., n.) фє $0 \nu \tau$ - (m., n.) ferent-(ferent-i.) (m., f., n.)

Sing. N. V.
A. bharant-am (m.)
bharat (n.)
I. bharat-â.
D. bharat-ê.

Ab. bharat-as.
G. bharat-as.
L. (Gr. D.) bharat-i.

ф'́pov ( n .)
фُ́povt- $\alpha$ (m.) ferent-em (m., f.)
申épov (n.) ferens (n.)

- ferent-i.
- ferent-ē(d).

фє́povt-oç. ferent-is.
фє́povt-七.
*Consult Bopp's "Comparative Grammar," vol. 1., pp. 449-519; and Schleicher's "Compendium," \&c., pp. 524-623.

Skr.
Plur. N. V. bharant-as (m.) bharant-i (n.)
A. bharat-as (m.)
,, bharant-i (n.)
I. bharad-bhis.
D. Ab. bharad-bhyas.
G. bharat-Am.
L. (Gr. D.) bharat-su.

Dual. N. A. V. bharant-âu (m.)
Ved. bharant-a (m.) bharant-î (n.)
blarat-i (n.)

| $"$ | Ved. bharant- 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $"$ | bharant-î (n.) |
| $"$ | bharat-î (n.) |

Gr.
L.
$\phi \varepsilon ́ \rho o \nu \tau-\varepsilon \varsigma$ (m.) ferent-ēs (m., f.)
ф́povt-a (n.) ferent-i-a (n.)
фध́povt-ac (m.) ferent-ēs (m., f.)
申́́povt-a (n.) ferent-i-a (n.) $^{\prime}$ )
-

- ferent-i-bus.
$\phi \varepsilon \rho o ́ v \tau-\omega \nu . \quad$ ferent-i-um.
$\phi \in \rho o v-\sigma \iota$.
I. D. Ab.
(Gr. D. G.) \}bharad-bhyam.
G. L. bharat-ôs.
III. a.-I. F., manas- (n.), durmanas- (n.), \&c.

| Stem. |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\begin{gathered} \text { Skr. } \\ \text { manas- (n.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gr. } \\ \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon \varsigma_{-}^{-(n .)} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{L} . \\ \text { genes-. } \end{array}$ |
|  | - | - | (gener-i-) (n.) |
| Sing. N. A. V. | manas. |  | genus. |
|  | manas-â. | - | - |
| " | - | $\kappa \rho \alpha ́ \tau \varepsilon \sigma-\phi \iota$. | - |
| D. | manas-ê. | - | gener-ì. |
| Ab. | manas-as. | - | gener--ē (d.) |
| L. (Gr. D. ${ }_{\text {a }}$ | manas-as. |  | gener-is. |
|  | manas_i. | $\mu \dot{\delta} \boldsymbol{\nu}$ ¢ $(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-\iota$. | - |
| Plur. N. A. V. | manains-i. | $\mu^{\varepsilon} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \boldsymbol{\eta}(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-\alpha$ ) | gener-a. |
| D. Ab . | manô-bhis. | ö $\chi$ ¢ $\sigma$ - $\phi$ ¢ | - |
|  | manô-bhyas. | - | gener-i-bus. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | manas-âm. | $\mu \varepsilon \nu \tilde{\omega} \nu(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-\omega \nu$. | gener-um. |
|  | manas-su. | $\mu^{\prime} \nu \boldsymbol{\nu} \in \sigma-\sigma_{t}$. | - |
| " | - | $\mu \varepsilon \chi^{\prime} \nu \varepsilon-\sigma \iota$. | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | manas-î. | $\mu \varepsilon \boldsymbol{\nu} \eta$ ( $-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-\varepsilon$. | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I. D. Ab. } \\ & (\text { Gr. D. G.) } \end{aligned}$ | manô-bhyam. | $\mu \varepsilon \nu 0 i ̃ \nu(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-0-t \nu$. | - |
| G. L. | manas-ôs. | - | - |

III. b.-I. E., dusmanas- (m., f.), \&c.

Stem. durmanas- (m., f.) $\delta v \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon$ - (m., f.) vetes-

| , | - |
| :--- | :--- |
| $"$ | - |
| $"$ | - |

Sing. N. V. durmanâs.
" - - $\quad \operatorname{arbos}\left(f_{0}\right)$
A. durmanas~am.
I. durmanas-â.
D. durmanas-ê.

Ab. durmanas-as.
G. durmanas-as.
L. (Gr. D.) durmanas-i.

Plur. N. V. durmanas-as.
A. durmanas-as.
I. durmanô-bhis.
D.Ab. durmanô-bhyas.
G. durmanas-âm.
L. (Gr. D.) durmanas-su.

Dual. N. A. V. durmanas-du.
durmanas~â.
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { I. D. Ab. } \\ \text { (Gr. G. D.) }\end{array}\right\}$ durmanô-bhyâm.
G. L. durmanas-ôs.

> IV. a.-I. E. akman- (m.), \&c.

Skr.
Stem. as'man- (m.)
Sing. N. as'má.
A. as'mân-am.
I. as'man-â.
D. as'man-ê.

Ab. as'man-as.
G. as'man-as.
L. (Gr. D.) as'man-i.
V. as'man.

Plur. N. V. as'man-as.
A. as'man-as.
D. I. as'ma-bhis.

Gr.
L.
homin-. (homin-i) (m.) homō. homin-em.
даінор-а.
-

- homin- $\overline{\text {. }}$
homin-ē (d).
homin-is.
баípov-os.
даі $\mu$ о $\nu$ и.
$\delta а i ̈ \mu о \nu$.
$\delta а i \mu о \nu-\varepsilon s$.
баіноv-as.
$\kappa о \tau v \lambda \eta \delta o \nu-o ́-\phi เ \nu$.

| - | $\left(\right.$ veter $\left.-i_{-}\right)(\mathrm{m} ., \mathrm{f} ., \mathrm{n})$. |
| :--- | :--- |
| - | $\operatorname{arbos-}$ |
| - | $\left(\operatorname{arbor}-i_{-}\right)\left(\mathrm{f}_{0}\right)$ |

$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon v \tilde{\eta}(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma \sim \alpha)$. arbor-em.

- arbor-ī.
L. (arbor-i-) (f.)
vetus (m., f., n.)
arbos (f.)
arbor-ē (d).
$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 ข ̃ \varsigma(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-o \varsigma) . a r b o r-i s$.
$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon i(-\nu \in \sigma-\iota)$.
$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon i ̃ \varrho(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-\varepsilon \varsigma)$. arbor-ēs.
$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \varepsilon і ̃ \varsigma(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-\alpha \varsigma) . a r b o r-\bar{e} s$.
- 
- 

$\delta v \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \tilde{\omega} \nu(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-\omega \nu)$. arbor-um.
$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu s{ }^{\prime} \sigma-\sigma \iota$.
$\delta v \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu \tilde{\eta}(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-\varepsilon)$.
$\delta \nu \sigma \mu \varepsilon \nu 0 i ̃ \nu(-\nu \varepsilon \sigma-0-\iota \nu)$.

|  | Skr． | Gr． | L． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D．Ab． | as＇ma－bhyas． | － | homin－i－bus． |
| G． | as＇man－àm． |  | homin－um． |
| L．（Gr．D．） | as＇ma－su． | баіло－б儿． | － |
| Dual．N．A．V． | as man－au． | － | － |
| ＂ | Ved．as＇man－â． | $\delta \alpha i \mu о \nu-\varepsilon$. | － |
| I. D. Ab. (Gr. D. Go) | as＇ma－bhyâm． | $\delta а ı \mu o ́ v-0-t \nu$. | － |
| G．L． |  | － | － |

IV．b．－I．E．gnôman－（n．），\＆c．

## Skr．

|  | Skr． | Gr． | L． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stem． | nüman－（n．） | $\tau a \lambda a \nu-(\mathrm{n}$. | nōmen－ |
| ＂ | － | － | （nōmin－i－）（n．） |
| Sing．N．A． | nâma． | тá入av． | nömen． |
| I． | nâmn－a． | － | － |
| D． | nâmn－ê． | － | nōmin－ı̀． |
| Ab． | namn－as． | － | nōmin－è（d）． |
| G． | nâmn－as． |  | nōmin－is． |
| L．（Gr．D．） | nâmn－i． | － | － |
| ＂ | nûnan－$i$ ． |  | － |
| V． | naman． |  | nömen． |
| ＂ | nâma | － | － |
| Plur．N．A．V． | namann－i． | ${ }_{\tau} \dot{\alpha} \lambda a v-\alpha$. | nōmin－a． |
| I． | nama－bhis． | － | － |
| D．Ab． | nama－bhyas． | － | nōmin－i－bus． |
| G． | namn－âm． | та入áv－$\omega \nu$ ． | nömin－um． |
| L．（Gr．D．） | nûmu－su． | тá入 $\alpha$－бı． | － |
| Dual．N．A．V． | nàmn－î． | $\tau \dot{\alpha} \lambda \boldsymbol{\nu} \nu-\varepsilon$. | － |
| I．D．Ab． | nâma－bhyâm． | $\tau a \lambda a ́ \nu-o-\tau \nu$ ． | － |
| Gr．G．D． | nâmn－ôs． | － | － |

V．a．－I．E．mâtar－（f．），patar－（m．），\＆c．

|  | Skr． | Gr． | L． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stem． | mûtar－（f．） | $\mu \eta \tau \varepsilon \rho-$（f．） | māter－ |
| ＂ | － | －－ | （mātr i ${ }^{\text {）（f．）}}$ |
| Sing．N． | mâtâ． | $\mu \eta \dot{\tau} \boldsymbol{\eta} \rho$ ． | māter． |
| A． | mâtar－am． | $\mu \eta \tau \underline{\varepsilon} \rho-\alpha$ ． | mätr－em． |
| I． | màtr－û． | － | － |
| D． | mâtr－ê． | － | mätr－z． |
| U 2 |  |  |  |


| Sing. Ab.G. | Skr. | Gr. | L. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | mâtu-s. | - | $m \bar{a} t r-\bar{e}(d)$. |
|  | matu-s. | $\mu \eta \tau \rho-$ ¢́c. | mātr-is. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | - |  | - |
|  | mâtar-i. | $\mu \eta \tau \varepsilon \rho-\iota$. | - |
| " | - | $\mu \eta \tau \rho-i$. | - |
| V . | matar. | $\mu \tilde{\eta} \tau \varepsilon \rho$. | māter. |
| Plur. N. V. | mâtar-as. | $\mu \eta \tau^{\prime} \rho-\varepsilon ¢$. | $m a ̈ t r-e ̄ s$, |
|  | mat $\hat{r}_{-s}$ (f.) | - | - |
|  | pitr-n (m.) | - | - |
| I. | Ved. pitar-as, | $\mu \eta \tau \dot{\varepsilon} \rho-a s$. | mātr-ēs. |
|  | mâtr-bhis. | - | - |
| D. Ab. | matr-bhyas. | - | mātr-i-bus, |
| G. | mat $t_{r}^{\text {- }}$-n-am. | - | - |
| L. (Gr. D.) | Ved. svasr-ûm: | $\mu \eta \tau \varepsilon \rho-\omega \nu$. | $m \bar{a} t r-u m$. |
|  | matr-shu. | $\mu \eta \tau \rho \alpha{ }^{\text {a }}$ - $\sigma$. | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | matar-âu. | - | - |
|  | Ved. matar-à. | $\mu \eta \tau \underline{\rho} \boldsymbol{\rho}$ - | - |
| $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { I. D. Ab. } \\ \text { (Gr. G. D.) } \end{array}\right\}$ | matr-bhyâm. | $\mu \eta \tau \mathfrak{\varepsilon} \rho-0-\iota \nu$. | - |
| G. L. | matr-ôs. | - |  |

> V. b.-I. E. dâtâr-(m.), \&c.

| Stem. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Skr. } \\ \text { datâr- (m.) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gr. } \\ \delta o \tau \eta \rho-(\mathrm{m} .) \\ = \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L} . \\ \text { datōr-. } \\ (\text { datōr-i-) }(\mathrm{m} .) \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sing, N. | dâtâ. | ôoríp. | datōr. |
| A. | dâtâr-am. | Soг $\tilde{\sim} \rho-\alpha$. | datōr-em. |
| I. | datr-â. | - |  |
| D. | datr-ê. | - | datōr-2. |
| Ab. | datu-s. | - | datōr-ē (d). |
| G. | datu-s. | ঠот $\tilde{\eta} \rho$-o¢. | datōr-is. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | datar-i. | $\delta о \tau \tilde{\rho} \rho-\iota$. | - |
| V . | dâtar. | סотй ${ }^{\text {d }}$ | datōr. |
| .Plur. N. V. | datar-as. | ঠот $\tilde{\square}$ - $\varepsilon$ ¢. | datōr-ēs. |
| A. | dattron. |  | datōr-ès. |
| I. | duttr-bhis. | - |  |
| D. Ab. | dûtr-bhyas. | - | datōr-i-bus. |
| G. | dattror-n-am. | $\delta о \tau \dot{\eta} \rho-\omega \nu$. | datōr-um. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | datr-shu. | סог $\dagger$ ¢ 0 -бı. | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | dâtar-au. | - | - |
|  | Ved. dàtâr-û. | ¿oг $\tilde{\eta} \rho-\varepsilon$. |  |

Skr
Gr.
L.
$\left.\begin{array}{l}\text { I. D. Ab. } \\ \text { (Gr. D. G.) }\end{array}\right\}$ dâtr-bhyâın.
G. L. dâtr-òs.
VI. a.-I. E. akva- (m.), yuga- (n.)

Skr.
Stem.
Sing. N.

| Sing. N. | $a s^{\prime} v a-s(\mathrm{~m} .)$ | $i \pi \pi 0-\varsigma(\mathrm{m} .)$ | equu-s (m.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| " | yuga-m (n.) | ¢vyó-v (n.) | jugu-m (n.) |
| A. | as'va-m (m.) | 'i $\pi \pi 0-\nu$ (m.) | equu-m (m.) |
| " | yuga-m (n.) | ¢ vyó-v (n.) | $j u g u-m$ (n.) |
| I. | as'vê-na. | - | - |
| " | Ved. $\boldsymbol{s}^{\prime} \boldsymbol{v} \hat{a}$. | аи̇тó-фı. | - |
| D. | $a s^{\prime} v a ̀-y a$. | ' $\pi \pi \pi \%$. | equoi, equo. |
| Ab. | as'và-t. | - | equo$-d$. |
| G. | as'va-sya. | $\because \pi \pi 0-\iota 0$ (-o-बyo). | equi. |
| " | - |  | - |
| L. | $a s^{\prime} v \hat{c}^{\text {en }}$ | оико-ı, $\boldsymbol{\mu}$ - $\boldsymbol{i}$. | domi. |
| V. | as'va. | ï $\pi \pi \varepsilon, \zeta$ ¢ $\boldsymbol{v}$ о́v. | eque, jugum. |
| Pl. N. V. | $a s^{\prime} v a-s$ (m.) | " $\pi \pi \pi 0-\iota$ (m.) | eque-i, equt ( m .) |
| " | Ved. as'vâ-sas (m.) | - | eque-is. |
| " | - | - | U. Ikuvinu-s. |
| " | - | - | 0. Nuvlani-s. |
| " | yugà-ni ( n .) | - | - |
| " | Ved. yuga (n.) | ¢ v $\chi^{\text {áa }}$ ( n ) | $j u g a(n$. |
| A. | as'và-n (m.) | " $\pi$ \% $0-v_{S}$ (m.) | еquб-s. |
| " | - | Kret. $\pi \rho \varepsilon \iota \gamma \nu \tau \alpha{ }^{-} \boldsymbol{\nu} \varsigma$. | - |
| " | $y u g \hat{d}-n i(\mathrm{n}$. | - | - |
| " | Ved. yugâ (n.) | ל̧vyá (n.) | $j u g a(\mathrm{n}$. |
| I. | as'vâ-is. | - | - |
| " | Ved. as'vê-bhis. | $\theta \varepsilon о$ ó- $\phi \iota \nu$. | - |
| D. Ab . | as'vê-bhyas. | - | equī-s, duб-bus. |
| G. | as'va-nam. | $i \pi \pi \omega \nu(-\pi 0-\omega \nu)$. |  |
|  | - | - | ечиб-rum. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | $a s^{\prime} v e \hat{e}-s h u$. | " $\pi \pi \pi 0-t-\sigma \iota$. | - |
| " | - | $i \pi \pi 0-\iota-5$. | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | $a s^{\prime} v a u$ (-va-au) (m.) | - | - |
| " | Ved. as'va (m.) | $i \pi \pi \omega$ (m.) | $d u o$ (m., n.) |
|  | yugê (n.) |  | - |
| $\left.\begin{array}{l} \text { I. D. Ab. } \\ \text { (Gr. G. D.) } \end{array}\right\}$ | $a s^{\prime} v a-b h y a ̂ m$. | $i \pi \pi 0-\iota \nu$. | - |
| L. G. | as' $\mathrm{C} a-y$-ôs. | - | - |

## VI. b.-I. E. akvâ (f.), \&c.

| Stem. | Skr. <br> $a s^{\prime} v a ̂-$ (f.) | $\begin{array}{r} \mathrm{Gr} . \\ \chi \omega \rho \alpha-(\mathrm{f} .) \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \mathrm{L} . \\ \text { equa- (f.) } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sing. N. | as'va. | $\chi$ ¢́¢ $\chi^{\text {a }}$. | equa. |
| A. | as'vâ-m. | $\chi \chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha}-\nu$. | еqua-m. |
| I. | as'va-y-a. | - | - |
| " | Ved. as'vâ. | - | - |
| , | - | $\beta i \eta-\phi ı$. | - |
| D. | $a s^{\prime} v \hat{a}-y-\hat{a} i$. | - |  |
| " | Ved. $a^{\prime}$ vầ-i (-vâ-ai.) | $\chi \chi^{\omega} \rho \underline{\rho}(-\rho a-\alpha \iota)$ | equā-i (-vĩolai) |
| " | - | - | equae. |
| Ab. | as'vâ-y-âs. | - | praedā-d. |
|  | - | - | 0. tovt $\overline{-}-d$. |
| G. | as'va-yas. | $\chi{ }^{\text {¢ }} \boldsymbol{\rho} \boldsymbol{\alpha}-\mathrm{s}$. | familia-s. |
| , | - | - | Prosepna-is. |
| " | - | - | , Diana-es. |
| " | - | - | equa-i, equae. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | as'va-y-am. | $\chi^{\alpha \mu}{ }^{\text {a }}$ i. | Romae. |
|  | - | - | 0.via-i. |
| V. | as'vê. | - | - |
| " | Ved. as'va. | $\chi \omega \dot{\rho} \boldsymbol{\alpha}$. | equa. |
| Pl. N. V. | $a s^{\prime} v a-\varepsilon$. | $\chi$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {¢ }}$ aı. | equai, equae. |
|  | - | - | O. scrifta-s. |
| n | - | - | U. urta-s. |
| A. | $a s^{\prime} v a-s$. | $\chi{ }^{\omega} \rho \bar{\alpha}-{ }^{\text {c }}$. | equa-s, $0 . \mathrm{vi}^{\text {e }}$ a-ss. |
| I. | as'va-bhis. | - | - |
| D. Ab. | as'va-bhyas. | - | equā-bus, equi-s. |
| " | - | - | 0. diumpa-ıs. |
| G. | $a s^{\prime} v a-n-a m$. | $\chi \omega \rho \alpha{ }^{-}-\omega \nu$. | equā-rum. |
| " | Ved. $a s^{\prime} v \hat{a}-m$. | $\chi \chi^{\omega} \rho \bar{\rho} \nu$. | - |
| L. (Gr. D.) | $a s^{\prime} \cdot \hat{a}-s u$. | $\chi \chi^{\omega \prime \rho a-t-\sigma \iota}$ | - |
| " | - | $\chi \dot{\omega} \rho \alpha-1-¢$. | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | $a s^{\prime} v \hat{\nu}$. | $\chi \omega \dot{\rho}$ а. | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I. D. Ab. } \\ & \text { (Gr. G. D.) } \end{aligned}$ | $\text { \}as vâ-bhyâm. }$ | $\chi \omega \dot{\rho} \alpha-\iota \nu$. | - |
| G. L. | $a s^{\prime} v \hat{a}-y-\hat{\theta} s$. | - |  |

## VII．－I．E．avi－（m．，f．），\＆c．

|  | Skr． | Gr． | L． |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stem． | avi－（m．，f．） | $\pi \lambda_{l} \lambda_{l}(\mathrm{f}),. k t-$（m．） | ovi－（f．），fasci（m．） |
| ＂ | vâri－（n．） | － | mari－（n．） |
| ＂ | $s^{\prime} u k^{\prime} i-(\mathrm{m} ., \mathrm{f} ., \mathrm{n} .)^{*}$ | $i \delta \rho \iota-$（m．，f．，n．） | $l e v i$（m．，f．，n．） |
| Sing．N． | avi－s（m．，f．） |  | ovi－s（f．） |
| ＂ | vâri（n．） | iofoc（n．） | mare（n．） |
| A． | avi－m（m．，f．） | $\pi \cos _{t-\nu}(\mathrm{f}$. | ovi－m（f．） |
| ＂ | vâri． |  | mare（ n.$)$ |
| I． | avi－n $n \hat{a}$（m．） | － | － |
| ＂ | avy－$\hat{\text { e }}$（f．） | － | － |
| ＂ | vâri－n－a（n．） | － | － |
| D． | avay－ê（m．，f．） | － | － |
| ＂ | $a v y-a i(f$. | － | ovì． |
| ＂ | vâri－n－ê（m．） | － | － |
| Ab． | avè－s（m．，f．） | － | ovè－$d$ ，marī－d． |
| ＂ | avy－as（f．） | － | － |
| ＂ | vâri－n－as（n．） | － | － |
| G． | avê－s（m．，f．） |  | ovi－s． |
| ＂ | avy－iss（f．） | Hom．$\pi$ ód $\eta$－os． | － |
| ＂ | vari－n－as（n．） | $\pi$ ódt－os． | － |
| L．（Gr．D．） | $a v-a u$（m．，f．） | $\pi$ о́入 $\varepsilon$－i． | － |
| ＂ | avy＇am（f．） | $\pi o ́ \lambda \varepsilon \ell, \pi$ ódì． | － |
| ＂ | vari－n－i（ n ．） | Hom．$\pi$ ó入 $\eta$－i． | － |
| v． | avê（m．，f．） | $\pi \operatorname{sid}_{\iota}(\mathrm{f}$. | ovi－s（f．） |
| ＂ | vâri（ n ．），varê（ n ．） |  | mare（n．） |
| Pl．N．V． | avay－as（m．，f．） | Hom．$\pi$ ó̀ $\eta$－Es（ f ．） | ouē－s（f．） |
| ＂ | － | $\pi$ módless（f．） | － |
| ＂ | － | $\pi$ тidet－c（f．） | － |
| ＂ | vari－n－i． | $i \delta \rho \iota-a$（n．）； | $\operatorname{mari}-a(\mathrm{n}$. |
| A． | avi－n（m．） | тódt－as（f．） | ovē－s（f．） |
| ＂ | avî－s（f．） | $\pi$ ódet－s（f．） | － |
| ＂ | － | Hom．$\pi$ ó入 $\eta$－ ¢ $_{\text {¢ }}$（f．） | － |
| ＂ | vârin－n－i． | $i \delta \rho \iota-\alpha$ ． | mari－a（n．） |
| I． | avi－bhis． | － | － |
| D．Ab． | avi－bhyas． | － | ovi－bus． |
| G． | avìn－âm． | $\pi \nu \lambda i-\omega \nu$ ， | ovi－um． |
| ＂ | － | $\pi$ ¢́̀ $\lambda$－$\omega \nu$ ． | － |

＊Neuter adjectives in $-i$ in Sanskrit in the D．Ab．G．and L．sing．，and in the G．and L．dual may follow the declension either of vâri（n．），or of avi（m．）．

VIII.-I. E. sûnu- (m.), \&c.

| Stem. | $\begin{gathered} \text { Skr. } \\ \text { sûnu- }(\mathrm{m} .) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Gr. } \\ \nu \in \kappa v-(\mathrm{m} .) \end{gathered}$ | L. <br> fructu- (m.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | dhênu- (f.) | $\sigma v$-(f.) | тапи- (f.) |
|  | talu- (n.) | $\mu \varepsilon \theta v$ - (n.) | cornu- (n.) |
|  | $m r d u-$ (m., n.)* | $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \nu-(\mathrm{m} ., \mathrm{n}$. | - |
| Sing. N . | sûnu-s (m. | ขéкv-¢ (m.) | fructu-s (m.) |
| " | talu (n.) | $\mu^{\prime} \theta^{\prime} v$ ( n .) | cornu- (n.) |
| A. | sûnu-m (m.) | $\nu$ ข́к์ข- ${ }^{\text {(m.) }}$ | fructu-m (m.) |
| " | talu (n.) | $\mu^{\prime} \dot{\varepsilon} \theta v$ (n.) | cornu (n.) |
| I. | sûnu-n-a (m.) | - | - |
| " | dhênv-â (f.) | - | - |
| " | talu-n-a (n.) | - | - |
| D. | sunav-ê (m.) | - | fructu-i. |
| " | dhênav-ê (f.) | - | fructu. |
| " | dhênv-ai (f.) | - | - |
| " | tâlu-n-ê ( n .) | - | - |
| Ab. | sûnô-s (m.) | - | magistratū-d. |
| " | dhênô-s (f.) | - | - |
| " | dhênv-ds (f.) | - | - |
| " | tâlu-n-as (n.) | - | - |
| G. | sûnô-s (m.) | $\nu$ verv-os. | fructu-os. |
| " | dhênô-s (f.) | $\gamma \lambda v \kappa$ ¢́-os. | fructū-s. |
| " | dhênv-às (f.) | ä $\sigma \tau \varepsilon-\omega ¢$ ( n .) | O. castrou-s (n.) |
| " | talu-n-as ( n ) | - | U. trifo-r. |
| L. (Gr. D.) | sûn- ${ }^{\text {a }}$ (m.) | $\nu$ ข่кข-ı. | - |
| " | dhên-âu (f.) | $\dot{\alpha} \sigma \tau \varepsilon \iota$. | - |
| " | dhênv-âm (f.) | - | - |

* Neuter adjectives in $-u$ in Sanskrit in the D. Ab. G. and L. sing., and in the G. and L. dual may follow the declension either of tâlu (n.), or sûnu (m.).

|  | Skr. | Gr. | L. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| L. (Gr. D.) | $t a ̂ l u-n-i$ ( n .) | - | - |
| V . | sûnô (m.) | $\nu$ ข¢кv. | fructu-s (m.) |
| " | dhênô (f.) | - | - |
| " | tâlồ (n.) | - | - |
| " | tâlu (n.) | $\mu^{\prime} \theta \boldsymbol{v}$. | cornu (n.) |
| Pl. N. V. | sûnav-as (m.) | $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon \tau_{¢}(-\kappa \varepsilon F-\varepsilon \varsigma)$ (m. | fructu-s (m.) |
| " | dhênav-as (f.) |  | - |
| " | tâlû̀n-i. |  | cornu-a (n.) |
| " | - | ä $\sigma \tau \eta$ (- $\tau \varepsilon F-\alpha$ ) ( n .) | - |
| Plur. A. | sûnû-n (m.) | ข¢́кv-ag. | fructū-s (m.) |
| " | Ved.sûnv-as (m.) | $\gamma \lambda v \kappa \varepsilon i_{S}(-\kappa \varepsilon F-\alpha ¢)$. | - |
| " | dhênù-s (f) |  | - |
| , | talü-n-i ( n .) | $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \kappa^{\mathcal{E}-a}$ ( n .) | cornu-a (n.) |
| " | - | ä $\sigma \tau \eta$ ( n .) | - |
| I. | sûnu-bhis. | - | - |
| D. Ab. | sînu-bhyas. | - | fructi-bus. |
| " | - | - | portu-bus. |
| G. | sûnû-n-âm. | $\nu \in \kappa \dot{v}-\omega \nu$, | fructu-um. |
| " | - | $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \hat{k}-\omega \nu$, | - |
| L. (Gr. D.) | sûnu-shu. | $\nu$ ขки̇-ยбо兀. | - |
| " | - | $\nu$ ข'кv-бб८. | - |
| " | - | $\nu$ ¢̇кv-б兀. | - |
| " | - | $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon$ ¢ - $\sigma$. | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | sûnû (m.) | $\nu$ ¢́rv-E. | - |
|  | dhênù (f.) | $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \mathfrak{E}-\varepsilon$. |  |
|  | talu-n-2. | - | - |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { I. D. Ab. } \\ & \text { (Gr. D. G.) } \end{aligned}$ | sûnu-bhyàm. | $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa \varepsilon$ ¢ -0-ı $\nu$. | - |
| G. L. | sûnv-ôs. | - | - |

> IX.-I. E. nâu- (f.), gvau- (m., f.), \&c.

|  | Skr. | Gr. | L. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stem. | $n a u-$ (f.) | $\nu \bar{\sim} v$ - (f.), Ion. $\nu$ ¢ $v$ - | nav-i-* (f.) |
| " | gô- (m., f.) | ßov- (m., f.) | bo- (bov-), bov-i- |

(m. f.)

* There were no diphthongal stems in Old Latin; diphthongs were avoided either by the addition of $i$, as in $n a v-i$, or by dropping the second vowel, as in $b o-$. Greek diphthongal stems, such as 'A $\chi \lambda \lambda \lambda \varepsilon u ́ c, ~ \& c ., ~ w h e n ~ i n t r o d u c e d ~ i n t o ~ L a t i n, ~$ became, in early times, Aciles, \&c.; while in later times either the Greek de-

| * | Skr. | Gr. | L. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Sing. N . | nâu-s, gâu-s. | $\nu a \tilde{v}-\varsigma, \beta$ ¢ ${ }^{\text {- }}$-s. | navi-s, bo-s, bov-i-s. |
| A. | nâv-am. | $\nu \tilde{\eta}-\alpha, \nu \alpha \hat{v}-\nu, \nu \varepsilon c^{\prime}-\alpha$. | nave-m. |
| " | $g a \hat{-}-m$. | $\beta$ ¢ขี- $\nu$. | bove-m. |
| I. | $n a ̂ v-\hat{a}, g a v-\hat{a}$. | - | - |
| " | - | $\nu a \tilde{v}-\phi \quad$. | - |
| D. | $n \hat{a} v-\hat{e}, ~ g a v-\hat{e}$. | - | navī, bovì. |
| Ab. | nâv-as, gô-s. | - | navē- (d), bovè (d). |
| G. | nâv-as. |  | navi-s. |
| " | gô-s. | $\beta$-ós. | bovi-s. |
| L. Gr. D. | nâv-i, gav-i. | $\nu \eta-\hat{t}, \nu \varepsilon-i, \beta 0-i . t$. | - |
| V . | nâu-s, gâu-s. | $\nu a \tilde{v}, \beta$ ov. | navi-s, bovi-s. |
| Plur. N. V. | nâv-as, gâv-as. | $\nu \tilde{\eta}-\varepsilon \varsigma, \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon^{\prime}-\varepsilon \varsigma, \beta o ́-\varepsilon \varsigma$. | navē-s, bovē-s. |
| A. | nâv-as. | $\nu \tilde{\eta}-a_{¢}, \nu a \tilde{v}-\varsigma, \nu \dot{\varepsilon}-\alpha ¢$. | navē-s. |
| " | $g \hat{a} v-a s, g \hat{a}-s$. | $\beta \delta^{\prime}-\alpha_{¢}, \beta$ oṽ-¢. | bovē-s. |
| I. | nâu-bhis, gô-bhis. | $\nu a \tilde{v}-\phi \iota \nu$. | - |
| D. Ab. | nâu-bhyas. | - | navi-bus. |
| " | gô-bhyas. | - | $b \bar{o}-b u s, b \bar{u}-b u s$. |
| G. | nâv-âm. | $\nu \eta-\tilde{\omega} \nu, \nu \varepsilon-\tilde{\omega} \nu$. | navi-um. |
| " | gav-âm. | $\beta 0-\tilde{\omega} \nu$. | bo-um. |
| Plur. L. | nâu-shu. | $\nu \dot{\eta}-\varepsilon-\sigma \sigma t, \nu \eta v \sim \sigma i$. | - |
| " | - |  | - |
| " | $g \hat{o}-s h u$. | $\beta{ }^{\prime}-\varepsilon-\sigma \sigma t, \beta o v-\sigma i$. | - |
| Dual. N. A. V. | $n \hat{a} v-\hat{a} u, g a ̂ v-a ̂ u$. | - | - |
| - • - . . | $n \hat{v} v-\hat{a}, g a ̂ v-a ̂$. | $\nu \tilde{\eta}-\varepsilon, \beta \delta^{\prime}-\varepsilon$. | - |
| I. D. Ab. $\text { (Gr. D. G.) }\}$ | nâu-bh̄yâm. gô-bhyâm. | $\begin{aligned} & \nu \eta-0-i ̃ \nu . \\ & \beta o-0-i \nu . \end{aligned}$ | - |
| G. L. | $n \hat{a} v$-ôs, gav-ôs. | - | - |

clension was followed, or the diphthong was resolved into its two constituent elements, and the word passed over to the o-declension ; thus we find N. Achilleus, Orphe-us, \&c. ; G. Achille-i, Orphe-i, Ulixe-i, \&c.

## CHAPTER IX.

## ADJECTIVES.*

## §. 152. The Comparative Degree.

The stem of the comparative degree was formed in IndoEuropean either by the addition of -yant ( $=$ yan-ta), or by that of -tara to the stem of the positive. Yant and tara may be derived either from verbal or from pronominal roots. Those writers who connect them with verbal roots derive -yant from I. E. root ya (to go), whence come Skr. ŷ̂ (id.), Gr. $\grave{\imath ́-v a l, ~ \& c . ; ~ a n d ~-t a r a, ~ f r o m ~ I . ~ E . ~ r o o t ~ t a r ~(t o ~ c r o s s ~ o v e r) ; ~}$ whence come Ved.tiras (across), Z. tarô (id.), Kelt. tair (id.), L. trans, Goth. thair-h, E. through. These roots signify a probgression, and consequently their addition to the positive heightens the idea implied by it. It is, however, better to derive these suffixes from pronominal roots, and to connect -yant with the common suffixes -ant, -m-ant, -v-ant, and to resolve -tara into the elements $t a$ and ra-the latter of which by itself sometimes expresses the idea of the comparative, as in Skr. avara (posterior), apara (id.), Goth. afar, G. aber, L. sup-er-us, \&c. As regards the relative age of these suffixes, it is probable that -yant is the older of the two, for it is a primary suffix, i. e. it must be attached immediately to the root, whereas -tara is a secondary suffix, and consequently must be of later introduction than those primary suffixes to which it is attached. We find, however, traces of -tara being used as a primary suffix in Skr. antara (interior, other), antar (within), L. inter, Goth. anthar (other), E. other, all from pronominal root an, Gr. $\phi i ́ \lambda-\tau \varepsilon \rho \circ \varsigma$, \&c.

[^98]
## §. 153. The Sanskrit Comparative.

I. The form in -yầns and -îyẩns. We find -yâns (£. -yast̂, n., -yas) in Ved. nav-yâns, from nava (new), Skr. sthê-yâns, from sthira (firm) ; sphê-yâns, from sphira (swollen) ; s'rê-yâns, from s'rîla (lucky) ; prê-yâns, from priya (dear); g'yâ-yâns, from R. g'y $\hat{a}$ (to grow old, overpower), the positive of which is not found, but which is supposed by Bopp to have been $g^{\prime} y \hat{a}-y i n$, formed from $g^{\prime} y \hat{a}$, as $y \hat{a}$-yin (going), from $y \hat{a}$; bhû-y $\hat{a} n s$, from bhûri (much), according to Bopp, or from bahu (much), according to Benfey. In sthêyânis, sphêyâns, s'rêyâns, and prêyầns the $i$ of the positive is gunated; but we may also explain the $\hat{e}$ in the first two of these forms by adding -îyâns to what were probably the original forms of their positives (omitting the ending -ra) sthara (from R. sth $\hat{a}=\mathrm{L} . ~ s t a$ ), and sphara (from R. sph $\hat{a}-y$, c. f. Gr. $\sigma \phi a i \rho a=\sigma \phi a \rho y a)$ : this latter explanation is, however, more improbable than the preceding one, for the stemvowel of the positive, if it be $i$ or $u$, is gunated when final $-r a$ is lost, as we shall see further on; and it is also possible that the form -îyầis had not been developed from -yâns before sphara and sthara had become sphira and sthira. The form - $\hat{y} y$ âns arose from -yâns through the influence of $y$, which has a tendency to generate $i$ before it, as in the Pâli nadiy $\hat{a}=$ Skr. $n a d y \hat{a}$, Instr. of $n a d \hat{\imath}$. That -yâns is older than -iyans appears at once from the cognate languages; thus, beside Skr. mahîyâns, from Ved. maha (great), we find Z. mas'-yas, Gr. $\mu \varepsilon \iota \zeta \nu \nu=\mu \varepsilon \gamma-y o v$, L. majōr = mag-yōr, from I. E. magh (to be mighty) ; beside Skr. $\hat{a} s^{\prime}$-îyâns, from $\hat{a} s^{\prime} u$ (swift), we find Z . $\hat{a} s^{\prime}-y a s, \mathrm{Gr} . \ddot{\omega} \kappa \iota \circ \nu=\dot{\omega} \kappa-y o v, \mathrm{~L} . \bar{o} c-i \bar{i} r$. Before-îyâns the final vowel of the positive stem is suppressed, and the vowel of its first syllable, if susceptible of gunation, receives it, except this vowel be $r$, which becomes $r a$, or $a$, which is unaltered. Thus we have alp-îyâns, from alpa (small), pâp-îyâns (= Gr.
$\kappa а \kappa-\iota o v)$, from pâpa (bad), var-îyâns (= Gr. ả $\rho \varepsilon-\iota \nu \nu)$, from vara (good), \&c.; sâdh-îyânis, from sâdhu (good), lagh-îyẩns (=Gr. ' $غ \lambda a \sigma \sigma o v=' \varepsilon \lambda a \chi-y o v)$, from laghu (light), gar-îyânis (=Gr. $\beta a \rho-\iota \nu \nu$ ), mrad-îyânis (=Gr. $\beta \rho a \delta-\iota o v)$, from $m r d u$ (soft), prath-îyônis, from prthu (=Gr. $\pi \lambda a \tau v$ ), \&c.; -ra is lost in kshêp-îyẩns, from kshipra (swift), \&c.; as in Gr. ai $\sigma \chi \nprec \circ \nu$, from ai $\sigma \chi \rho \circ$, \&c. ; -la is lost in s'rê-yâiis, from s'ri-la (lucky); -ya is lost in prê-yâns, from priya (dear) ; adjectives in -mant, -vant, -vin, and -târ lose these suffixes before -îyânin.
II. The form in -tara. This suffix is attached immediately to the positive stem, as in punya-tara, from punya (pure), bali-tara, from balin (strong), final $n$ being lost, beside Ved. supathin-tara. In words with two stems -tara is attached to the weak form, and in words with three, to the intermediate one, as mahat-tara, from mahat, the weak form of mahânt (strong), and vidvat-tara, from vidvat, the intermediate form of vidvâns (Gr. घıסот), beside Ved. vidush-tara, from the weakest form of vidvâns, \&c. In the pronoun we find this suffix constantly employed, as in ka-tara (uter), from ka (=I.E. kva, L. qui-s), ya-tara (uter), from ya (=Gr. o-), i-tara, from $i$ ( $=\mathrm{L} . i$-s, whence $i$-terum $=$ Ved. $i$-taram), êka-tara (one of two), from êka (one), \&c. From the preposition ut (up) is formed ut-tara (higher) $=$ Gr. $\dot{v} \sigma-\tau \varepsilon \rho o$.

## §. 154. The Greek Comparative.

I. The form in -oov. In adding this termination to the stem of the positive final, $o, v$ and $\rho o$ are omitted, as in $\phi \iota \lambda$-ıo $\nu$, from $\phi \iota \lambda о$, ка-к-七оv, from како; ò $\lambda \iota \zeta_{o \nu} \nu=\dot{\partial} \lambda \iota \gamma-y o v$, from $\dot{\partial} \lambda \iota \gamma о$; $\mathfrak{\eta} \delta-\iota \circ \nu$, from $\dot{\eta} \delta v ; \theta a \sigma \sigma o v=\tau a \chi-y o v$, from $\tau a \chi v$; £̇ $\lambda a \sigma \sigma \circ \nu$ $=\varepsilon \lambda a \chi-y o v$, from ह̀ $\lambda a \chi v ; \gamma \lambda \nu \kappa-\iota \nu$, and $\gamma \lambda \nu \sigma \sigma o \nu$ ( $\sigma \sigma=\kappa y$ ), from $\gamma \lambda \nu \kappa v, \beta_{\rho a \delta-\iota o v ~ a n d ~} \beta \rho a \sigma \sigma o v(\sigma \sigma=\delta y$ ), from $\beta \rho a \delta v$; $\pi a \chi-\iota \circ \nu$ and $\pi a \sigma \sigma o \nu(\sigma \sigma=\chi y$ ), from $\pi a \chi v ; \mu a \sigma \sigma o \nu=\mu a \kappa-y o \nu$, from $\mu \alpha \kappa-\rho \circ$; aio $\chi^{-\iota o \nu, ~ f r o m ~ a i \sigma ~} \chi-\rho \circ$, \&c.
II. The form in - $\tau \rho \circ$. In adding this termination to the
stem of the positive, the stem-vowel is generally retained, $-\tau \varepsilon \rho o$ being a secondary suffix, as in $\phi \iota \lambda \omega-\tau \varepsilon \rho o$, from $\phi i \lambda o$ (the stem-vowel here being lengthened as the penult is short),
 from $\chi^{a \rho \iota \varepsilon \tau, ~ t h e ~ w e a k ~ f o r m ~ o f ~} \chi a \rho เ \varepsilon \nu \tau, \& c$. In $\phi \iota \lambda-\tau \varepsilon \rho o$ this suffix is primary, being attached directly to the root.

By adding - $\tau \varepsilon \rho o$ to the preceding form of the comparative suffix - $\iota \boldsymbol{\nu}=$ yan-s, we obtain the forms - $\varepsilon \sigma-\tau \varepsilon \rho о,-\iota \sigma-\tau \varepsilon \rho \circ$, and -at-тєןo;* as in $\dot{a} \phi \theta o v-\varepsilon \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho o$, from $a \phi \theta o v o ; ~ \lambda a \lambda-\iota \sigma \tau \varepsilon \rho o$, from $\lambda a \lambda o ; \phi \iota \lambda$-alt₹ $\rho o$, from $\phi \iota \lambda o, \& c$. ; the stem-vowel being lost in these cases. In -at-т\& $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ o it is possible that $a$ may belong to the stem, and so represent the original $a$ from which o was developed; Benfey, however, considers -at to be an old locative termination, to which the comparative suffix was attached. We find the two forms -ov and - $\tau \varepsilon \rho o$ combined also in $\dot{a} \sigma \sigma o-\tau^{\prime} \rho \omega$, from $\dot{a} \sigma \sigma o v=a \gamma \chi-y o v$, and in the Hom. $\dot{\varepsilon} \pi a \sigma \sigma u ́ \tau \varepsilon \rho \sigma \iota$ from the same root. The suffix -т $\varepsilon \rho o$ is added also to prepositions, numerals, and pronouns ; as $\pi \rho o-\tau \varepsilon \rho o$, from $\pi \rho \circ ; \delta \varepsilon v-\tau \varepsilon \rho \circ$, from $\delta$ र́o; $\varepsilon-\tau \varepsilon \rho \circ$, from $i ; \pi o-\tau \varepsilon \rho \circ \circ$ and $\kappa o-\tau \varepsilon \rho o$, from I. E. $k v a$, \&c. It is also employed in other cases where only opposition in space is implied, as in $\delta_{\varepsilon} \xi_{l} \cdot \tau \varepsilon \rho o$,
 the suffix $-\iota=$ I. E. $-y a$.

## §. 155. The Latin Comparative.

I. The form in -iōs (m. f. n.), later -iōs (m. f.), -ius (n.). The masc. -ior and the neut. -ius were both originally -iōs; the neuter -iùs is still found in Plautus. This suffix is both primary and secondary in Latin; in adding it to vocalic positive stems the stem-vowel is always lost. Thus we have sapient-ior, from sap-ient; prob-ior, from prob-o ; lev-ior, from $l e v-i=l e g-u-i ; \quad$ major $=m a g-j o r, m a-j u s$, and $m a g-i s=m a g-i u s$,

[^99]from R. mag, whence mag-nus ; min-or $=$ min-jor, from R. $\min$; plūs =plo-jus, from I. E. par or pra (to fill), whence ple-nus, ple-rique; Gr. $\pi \lambda \varepsilon-i \omega \nu$, \&c.
II. The form in -tero. This suffix is not used in Latin to form regular comparatives. It is, however, of frequent oc-
 (which of two), from I. E. kva (who); neu-ter, al-ter, from the same root, as Gr. ä $\lambda \lambda o-s=\dot{a} \lambda-y o s$, L. al-iu-s, \&e.; ce-temu-s
 vo-s. We find -ter also employed to form prepositions: as in pre-ter, prop-ter, in-ter; and adverbs, as in sub-ter, audac-ter, pari-ter, \&c. It appears as trō in ul-trō and -intrō; and as $-\operatorname{tr} \bar{a}$ in $e x-\operatorname{tr} \bar{a}, i n-\operatorname{tr} \bar{a}$, con-trā, \&c. These forms in $-\operatorname{tr} \bar{a}$ are supposed by some to be old instrumentals, just as in Skr. the instr. antarêna is used adverbially; this view is, however, wrong, for they are really old ablatives, as we see from O.L. exsträd $=$ extra $\overline{\text { a }}$.

In many cases both forms of the comparative suffix are united in Latin. Thus in sin-is-tero-, min-is-tero-, mag-is-tero-, we have -is-tero $=$ I. E. $-y$ âns + tara ; and in dex-ter-ior, in-ter-ior, ci-ter-ior, \&c., we have -ter-ior = I. E. -tara + yâns. With sin-is-tero, \&c., may be compared the Gr. $\lambda a \lambda-\epsilon \sigma-\tau \varepsilon \rho o$, $\& c$.

## §. 156. The Indo-European Superlative.

In Indo-European the idea of the superlative was expressed by adding either -ma or -ta to the stem of the positive. After the first separation that occurred in the I. E. family of languages, these suffixes were either used separately, or united together, or doubled, or $t a$ and tata were added to -yâns. Thus we find -ta in the stems Skr. shash-tha $=$ Gr. sk-тo, L. quar-to, \&c. : -ma in Skr. nava-ma ( $=$ L. no-no by assimilation for nomo), Skr. ava-ma (low) from ava (down), which is, perhaps, connected with Gr. aũu, aủ-тós, L. au-t,
au-tem, Skr. agri-ma (first), from agra (a point), L. sum-mo for sup-mo, \&c.; -tama* in Skr. punya-tama from punya (holy), and other superlatives, in pra-thama (beside Gr. $\pi \rho \omega-\tau 0$, L. pri-mo), \&c., L. op-timo, \&c.; -mata in Gr. $£ \beta \delta o-\mu a r o \dagger$ (beside $\oint \beta \delta o-\mu o$ ), $\pi v-\mu a \tau o$ (for $\pi v \sigma-\mu a \tau o$, from $\pi v \varsigma$, an Æolicised form of a root $\pi$ os which is connected with Skr. pas'k'ât, after, Gr. $\dot{\delta}-\pi i \sigma-\omega, \mathrm{L}$. pos-t, po-ne = pos-ne, O. pos-mo-m $=\mathrm{L}$. postremum), and especially in the Irish ordinals, as secht-mad (the 6th), ocht-mad (the 8th), \&c.; -mama, also in the Irish forms uaisli-mem, from uasal (high) ; doir-bem, from dóir (a slave), with $b$ for $m$, \&c. ; -tata in Gr. кovфо-тато, and other superlatives ; -yâns $+t a=i s h-t h a$, in Skr. mah-ishtha $(=$ Gr. $\mu \varepsilon \gamma-$ $\iota \sigma \tau \circ, \& \mathrm{c} .$, and $=\iota \sigma-\tau \circ$ in Gr. $\grave{\omega}-\iota \sigma \tau \circ$, \&c.; -yâns $+t a+t a=-\iota \sigma-$ $\tau \alpha-\tau о,-\varepsilon \sigma-\tau \alpha-\tau о,-\alpha \iota-\tau \alpha-\tau о$ in Gr .

## §. 157. The Sanskrit Superlative.

The form in -ta is found in some ordinal numbers, as $k^{\prime}$ atur-tha $=$ Gr. $\tau \varepsilon \tau a \rho-\tau о$, \&c. Ish-tha- is of common occurrence, and is added to the stem in the same way as the comp. suffix $̂ y \hat{a} n i s$, as in pap-ishtha ( $=$ Gr. как-ьтто), \&c. Ma-is found in ashta-ma (the 8th), nava-ma (the 9th), madhya-ma (middle), \&c. Tama- is the usual superlative suffix, as in mahat-tama, \&c.; it is also found in the ordinals, as in vins'ati-tama (the 20th), \&c. From the superlative g'yêshtha (eldest) is also formed the double superlative $g^{\prime} y e ̂ s h t h a-t a m a$.

* Bopp derives -tama from -tara $+m a$, and - $\tau \alpha \tau 0$ from $-\tau \alpha \rho 0+\tau 0$; he had previously suggested tan (to stretch) as the root of both forms; but it is much more probable that they arise from the pronominal roots $t a$ and $m a$, as these roots are separately found expressing the idea of the superlative.
$\dagger$ Lottner and others consider that initial $m$ of the suffixes $-m a$ and -mata belongs sometimes to the stem, and that the words noticed in the text should be divided thus: Skr. ashtam-a, navam-a; Gr. $\dot{\varepsilon} \beta \delta \rho \mu-0$, ¿ $\beta \delta о \mu-\alpha$ то ; Ir. sechtm-ad, \&c.


## §. 158. The Greek Superlative.

The form in -ro is found in some ordinal numbers, as тєтар-то, \&c. I $\sigma$-то is added to stem in the same way as the comp. suffix -七оу, as in $\dot{\eta} \delta$-ıбто, from $\dot{\eta} \delta \boldsymbol{\delta}, \& \mathrm{c}$. Ta-то is the usual superlative suffix, as in $\phi(\lambda$-тато, $\& c$. ; added to the comparative suffix -yâns, it appears as -al-тato, - $\varepsilon \sigma-\tau a \tau 0,-\iota \sigma-$
 from $\dot{\eta} \sigma u \chi o, \sigma \omega \phi \rho \circ \nu, \pi \tau \omega \chi o$, \&c. We find $-\mu \circ$ in $\vdots \beta \delta \sigma-\mu о$ and $\pi \rho о-\mu о$ and $-\mu a-\tau о$ in $\{\beta \delta о-\mu a \tau o$ and $\pi v-\mu a \tau о$.

## §. 159. The Latin Superlative.

The form in -to is found in some ordinal numbers, as quin-to-, \&c.; also in quo-to-, from I. E. kva. Mo- is found in $i$-mo-, sum-mo-, ${ }^{*} \& \mathrm{c}$. In min- $i-m o-$ and $p l u r-i-m o-$, it is added to the comparative suffix -ios, of which the vowel $i$ alone is left; and we find it added to the other comparative suffix -ter in ex-tre-mo-beside ex-timo-, pos-tre-mo-beside pos-tu-mo-. The form -timo or -tumo is found in op-timo-, and op-tumo-, dex-timo-, maximo- = mag-timo-, pessimo- = pep-timo-, proximo- $\dagger=$ prop-timo-, liberrimo- = liber-timo-, facillimo- = facil-timo-, \&c. This suffix is also used in other words without expressing any superlative idea, as in fini-timo-, mari-timo-, \&c. Timo is added to the comparative suffix -ios, which here becomes is, and -is-timo becomes -issimo-, as in prob-issimo-, levissim-o, pot-issimo-, \&c.

* I-mo is a superlative stem formed from the preposition in, and summo is a superlative of sub.
+ This is Benfey's view, who connects the word with Skr. pâpa (bad), L. peccare ; pejor is, in his view, for pepjor. Lottner, however, connects it with an I. E. root $p \hat{\imath}$ (to hate), whence E. fiend, \&c.


# CHAPTER X: 

## NUMERALS.

## §. 160. The Cardinal Numbers.*

I.-Ind. Eur. : the idea of unity was probably marked by the demonstrative stem $i$ - or its gunated form ai-.
Sanskrit : $\hat{e}-k a-$ from $\hat{e}-=I$. E. ai-, the gunated form of the demonstrative stem $i-$, and $k a-. \dagger$
 = I. E. sam, or sa, whence Gr. $\ddot{a}-\pi a \xi$, Kret. ${ }_{a} \mu-a \kappa \iota s$ (once), Tarent. a’ $\mu$-atıs (id.), Skr. sa-krt (id.), L. sem-el, sim-plex, sin-guli, and mia would then be $=\operatorname{sam}^{2}$
 must represent a lost digamma; and if this be so, then it is possible that $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{v}} \boldsymbol{v}$ may be an older form of the stem, with which we may compare the Lith. véna-s (one), and E. one (as pronounced). If Bopp's explanation of Lith. vénas (Comp. Gram. II., p. 57) be correct, then it is also possible that Gr. F $\varepsilon v$ may be $=$ an
 demonstrative stems $i$ and $a$ are united. Gr. oi-Fo(whence oio-s) is identical with Z. aeva (one). Gr.

[^100]oì- $\nu$ ó- $\varsigma$, oì $\nu \dot{\prime}$ (one) correspond also exactly to 0 . L. oino-s, Goth. aìn-s; ot- in olyós and oĩos, being from the stem $i$ - .
Latin : uno-s = O. L. oino-s, from stem $i-$. II.-Ind.-Eur. : dva-.*

Sanskrit: dva-, dvi- (in compounds); dvis (twice).
 Mod. Gr. $\delta v o \nu u ̈ v \nu, ~ D . ~ \delta u o i ̆ v, ~ \delta v \omega ́, ~ D o r . ~ \delta u \sigma i ́, ~ Æ o l . ~$
 (originally meaning between and then through), for $\delta F_{l}$ $a$, Instr. of stem $\delta \mathrm{F}$, as E. between is from twain; סot ${ }^{\prime}$, סoooí (two), from stem $\delta \mathrm{Fi}_{\mathrm{t}}$; ; $\delta \iota$ - (in compounds) ; $\delta \varepsilon ́$ (lit. secondly).
Latin : m. duo, f. duae, n. duo (and dua in vulgar Latin), Acc. m.duo, duos; f. duas ; bini for dvini; bis for dvis;

- Various methods of explaining the numerals have been suggested; but, except in the case of the first numeral, which is probably derived from a demonstrative stem, none of these explanations are satisfactory. Thus tri- is derived from I. E. tar (to cross); but how is the idea of crossing connected with the idea of three more than with that of four ? Kvankva is supposed to be the reduplication of a root kvan, which is said to mean to seize, whence are derived Skr. sivan (a dog), Gr. kvov, \&c., and therefore to have originally meant the five fingers, as that part of the body with which we seize anything; but what proof have we that such a root ever existed? Skr. pañh'an is again connected with pâni (the hand), but panni is probably for par-ni from par (to fill). The I. E. form of ten is said to be dva-kvan from dva- (2), and kvan- (5) ; but there are no traces of the two $v$ s in any I. E. language. Again, it is suggested that the root of dakan is I. E. dak (to point out), whence come Gr. $\delta$ \&ixvv $\mu$, סákrvえos; L. digitus, Skr. dis' (to point out), \&c. Kantam probably meant host, multitude; but its origin is obscure. Other methods of explaining the numerals have been suggested, but so absurd as scarcely to deserve notice; thus Skr. tisar (fem. three) is derived from tri (3), and $\operatorname{strî}$ (a wọman)! Ashtâu (8) is for as'vâu (two horses), \&c.! It is also impossible to connect the I. E. numbers with the Shemitic ; the likeness that exists between the names of numbers six and seven is merely accidental.
du-plum, du-plex. N. U. duf (duos), duir (duobus), O. U. tuves (duobus), N. U. du- (in compounds), L. $b i-$ (id.).
III.—Ind. Eur. : tri-.

Sanskrit: m. n. tri-, f. tisar- for titar-, according to Bopp, a reduplicated form of tri-; tri-s (thrice).
Greek: m. f., т $\rho \varepsilon i \varsigma$, Dor. $\tau \rho i ̄-\varsigma$; n. $\tau \rho i-a$, from $\tau \rho \iota$; roís.
Latin : m. f., tres, n. tri-a, from tri-; ter; O. U. tri- in tribriçu (triplicatio).
IV.-Ind.-Eur.: kvatvar-.

Sanskrit: m. n., $k^{\prime} a t v \hat{a} r-, k^{\prime} a t u r-$; f. k'atasar- (according to Bopp, from ka, one, and tasar, three); l'atur (four times).

 Hom. $\pi i \sigma v \rho \varepsilon \varsigma$ ( $\varepsilon$ becoming $\iota$ through the influence of $v)$; New Ion. and Mod. Gr. $\tau \varepsilon \in \sigma \sigma \rho \varepsilon \varsigma \varsigma ; \tau \varepsilon \tau \rho a ́-\kappa \iota \varsigma$.
Latin : quatuor and quattuor, quadru- (in compounds), quater; U. petur- (in compounds), O. petor-a, whence Petr-ejus, petiro- (in compounds).
V.-Ind.-Eur. : kvanleva-.

Sanskrit: pañk'an-.
Greek : $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \varepsilon \nu \tau \varepsilon$ for $\pi \varepsilon \nu \tau a$ found in $\pi \varepsilon \nu \tau \dot{\alpha}-\kappa \iota \varsigma$, for I. E. -an becomes -a in Greek; Æol. $\pi^{\varepsilon} \mu \pi \varepsilon$, the gen. of which

Latin : quinque, O. pomtis, whence Pontius (= L. Quinctius), Pomp-ejus: $p=\mathrm{I}$. E. $k v$ as in W. pump (5), \&c.
VI.-Ind.-Eur.: ksvaks-; from this complicated form alone can be deduced the various words expressing the idea of six, in the Indo-European languages. Thus in Z. khsva-s we find the initial ksv still preserved; ks is found in Ossetian achsaz $\dagger$ and the initial sh in Skr.

* "Ahrens de Dialectis Æolicis et Pseudæolicis," p. 245.
$\dagger$ The $a$ in achsaz is merely prosthetic, as $\varepsilon$ in $\begin{gathered} \\ \varepsilon\end{gathered} \theta^{\prime} \varepsilon$ 's.
shash arises from $s$ through the influence of the preceding $k$; $s v$ is found in Afghan spash (Afgh. $s p=$ Skr. $s v$ ), and in Welsh chwech (W. chw = Skr. $s v^{*}$ ); $s$ is found in Gr. $\begin{gathered}\text { eq } \\ \ell\end{gathered}$ (aspirate $=s$ ), L. sex, Ir. sé ; $v$ is found in Dor. F $\mathrm{F}^{\prime} \xi$, Armenian we $\dot{z}$.
Sanskrit: shash-.

Latin: sex.
VII.-Ind.-Eur. : saptam- or saptan-.

Sanskrit: saptan-.
Greek : £̇ $\pi \tau a ́, ~ M o d . ~ G r . ~ \grave{\varepsilon} \phi \tau a ́$.
Latin : septem. Bopp supposes that the final $m$ in septem, novem, and decem is due to the influence of the corresponding ordinal numbers, septimo-= Skr. saptama-, \&c. VIII.-Ind.-Eur. : aktam-, or, according to Bopp, aktâu-.

Sanskrit: ashtan- (after analogy of saptan-), nom. ashtâu, apparently a dual form, as s'ivâu from s'ica (m.), 8 being equal to twice 4 , and therefore being the dual of 4 .
Greek : òкт $\dot{\prime}$, Dor. óкт $\dot{\omega}$ (the aspirate being added as in Fr. huit, from L. ccto, New Pers. hest = Skr. ashtâu), Mod. Gr. ó $\chi$ т $\omega$.
Latin : octo.
IX.-Ind.-Eur. : navam- or navan-.

Sanskrit: navan-.
Greek: èvvéa, Dor. év $\nu \in ́ a, ~ M o d . ~ G r . ~ ह ̇ \nu \nu ı a ́ . ~$
Latin : novem.
X.-Ind.-Eur. : dakam- or dukan-.

Sanskrit: das'an-.
Greek: ס£́кa.
Latin : decem, U. deçem.
XI.-Ind.-Eur. : ai-(?) dakam-(this and the other I. E. numbers up to XIX. were probably two separate words).

* Thus we have W. chwegyr $=$ Skr. $s^{\prime} v a^{\prime} ' r \hat{u}$ (where s'v = I. E. sv), W. chwuer (O. W. chwior) $=$ Skr. svasar.
- Sanskrit: êkâ-das'an-.

य Latin: un-decim.
XH——nd.:Eur: : dva-dakam-
Sanskrit: dvâ-das'an-.
 Alcæi Fragmenta,* 98), ס́́ка סúo.
Latin : duo-decim, U. desen-du-f (acc. pl.).
XIII.-Ind.-Eur. : tri- dakam-.

Sanskrit: trayô-das'an-.
Greek: $\tau \rho \iota \varsigma$-каї- $\delta \varepsilon к а, \delta \varepsilon к а-\tau \rho \varepsilon і ̈ \varsigma$.
Latin: trĕ-decim.
XIV.-Ind.-Eur. : kvatvar- dakam-.

Sanskrit: k'atur-das'an-.

Latin: quatuor-decim.
XV.-Ind.-Eur. : kvankva- dakam-.

Sanskrit: pañk'a-das'an-.
Greek: $\pi \varepsilon \nu \tau \varepsilon$-каí-סєка.
Latin: quin-decim.
XVI.-Ind.-Eur. : ksvaks- dakam-.

Sanskrit: shô-das'an-.
Greek: $\varepsilon_{\kappa} \kappa \kappa a i$ - $\delta \varepsilon \kappa \alpha$.
Latin: se-decim, sex-decim.
XVII.-Ind.-Eur. : saptam-dakam-.

Sanskrit: sapta-das'an-.
Greek: ह̇лта-каї-סєка.
Latin: septem-decem.
XVIII.-Ind.-Eur.: aktam- dakam-.

Sanskrit : ashtâ-das'an-.
Greek: ỏктє-каí-дєка.

- Latin : decem et doto [duo-de-viginti].
XIX.-Ind.-Eur.: navam-dakam-.
* "Ahrens de Dialectis Æolicis et Pseudæolicis," p. 255.

Sanskrit: nava-das'an- [ûna-vinis'ati-].
Greek: દ̇vvea-каí-סєка.
Latin : decem et novem [un-de-viginti].
XX.-Ind.-Eur. : dvi-dakan-ta- or dvi-dakan-ti-.

Sanskrit : vïns'ati- = dvin-das' $a-t i-$. The nasal in dvin is probably the remains of the nom. pl. case-ending of a neuter stem dvi-.
 sychius notices iкavtıv ( $\varepsilon \iota \kappa a \sigma \iota \nu$ ), which is remarkable on account of the retention of the $\nu$ before $\tau$.
Latin: viginti, $g$ taking the place of the original $c$, which is retained in vicesimus, vicies.
XXX.—Ind.-Eur. : tri-dakan-ta-, or tri-dakan-ti-.

Sanskrit : triins'ati- or trins'at-.
Greek: $\tau \rho \iota \overline{\bar{a}} \kappa о \nu \tau a$ (gen. $\tau \rho \iota \eta \kappa \dot{c} \nu \tau \omega \nu$, Hes. Op. et D. 694) a neuter pl. the first $a$ being lengthened. The remaining decades XL.-XC. are also neuters pl.
Latin: triginta for triäginta, a neuter pl., as are also the remaining decades.
XL.-Ind.-Eur. : kvatvar-dakan-ta-, or kvatvar-dakan-ti-.

Sanskrit: k'atvârinis'at-.
 Ion. $-\eta$ - and Dor. $-\omega-=-\bar{a}-$.
Latin : quadrāginta.
L.-Ind.-Eur. : kvankva-dakan-ta-, or kvankva-dakan-ti-.

Sanskrit: pañk'âs'at-.
Greek: $\pi \varepsilon \nu \tau \eta \dot{\jmath} о \nu \tau a .-\eta-=-\bar{a}-$.
Latin: quinquäginta.
LX.-Ind.-Eur. : ksvaks-dakan-ta, or ksvaks-dakan-ti-.

Sanskrit: shashti-.

Latin : sexāginta.
LXX.-Ind.-Eur.: saptan-dakan-ta-, or saptan-dakan-ti-:

Sanskrit: saptati-.
 Latin : septuāginta for septumāginta from ordinal stem sep-tumo-.
LXXX.-Ind.-Eur. : aktâu-dakan-ta-, or aktâu-dakan-ti-.

Sanskrit : as'îti-.
Greek : óy $\delta o \eta \kappa \kappa \nu \tau a$ from ordinal stem óy $\delta o o-$, with $-\eta$ - for

Latin: octo-ginta.
XC.-Ind.-Eur. : navan-dakan-ta-, or navan-dakan-ti-.

Sanskrit: navati-.


Latin: nonäginta from ordinal stem nono-.
C.-Ind.-Eur. : kantam.

Sanskrit: s'ata-m.

Latin: centu-m.
CC-DCCCC.-Ind.-Eur. : here no compound forms were found, but the constituent numerals were kept separate, as in E. two hundred, \&c.
Sanskrit: here also the constituent numerals were either kept separate, as in dvê s'atê (200), or the compound numeral was formed in usual way, as dvis'ata- (200), \&c.
Greek: $\delta \iota \bar{a} \kappa o ́ \sigma \iota o-$ (m. -oı, f. -aı, n. -a) ; Ion. $\delta \iota \eta \kappa о \sigma \iota \iota^{-}$, Dor. ঠıакатьo-, \&c.
Latin: ducento- (m. -i, f. -ce, n. -a) ; trecento-, quadringento-, quadrin- being formed after the analogy of septin-; quingento- for quinc-gento- ; sexcento-, septingento-, octin-gento-, where octin- is either formed after analogy of septin-, or else = I. E. aktan-; nongento- from ordinal stem nono-.
M.-Ind.-Eur.: —_?

Sanskrit: sahasra- (m. and n.).
Greek: $\chi^{i} \lambda \iota o^{-}$(m. $-o \iota$, f. $-a ı$, n. $-a$ ), Lesb. $\chi^{\varepsilon} \lambda \lambda \iota-$, Bœot. $\chi^{\varepsilon} \lambda \iota \circ-$, Dor. $\chi \eta \lambda \iota 0-$. Bopp suggests that this stem
may be connected with Skr. salasra-, the original Greek form having been $\sigma a \not \chi^{\prime} \lambda_{10}$, then $\dot{a} \chi^{\prime} \lambda_{\iota 0}$, and finally $\chi^{\iota \lambda} \lambda 0-; r$ became $\lambda$, and the preceding $s$ was assimilated in the Lesb. form, or became $\iota$, as in Bœot., and a new suffix $-\iota o=$ Skr. $-y a$ was added. Schleicher, on the other hand, considers $\chi^{\varepsilon} \lambda y o$ - to have been the original stem, which would be identical with an J. E. ghar-ya-.
Latin : milli- (mille, milli-a).
§. 161. The Ordinal Numbers.
In Indo-European the ordinals appear to have been formed by adding either -ta or sometimes -ma to the cardinal stems ; pra-ta- or pra-ma- (1st), dea-ta- (2nd), tri-ta- (3rd), kvatvar-ta(4th), kvankva-ta- (5th), ksvaks-ta- (6th), sapta (m)-ma or sap-tan-ta (7th), akta(m)-ma- or aktâv-(m)a-(8th), navan-ta- or nava ( $m$ )-ma- (9th), dakan-ta- or dakan $(m)$-ma- (10th). The ordinal decades were formed in a similar way. The ordinals from 11 to 19 , \&c., were formed of two separate words, as prata- dakanta- (11th $=1$ st +10 th $)$, \&c.

In Sanskrit we have prathama- (1st), from preposition pra and superlative suffix -tama ; dvitîya- (2nd) for dvitya (Gr. ס̀ı $\sigma \sigma o-$ ), $=d v a-t a-y a-$; trtî̀â- (3rd) furtritya-(Gr. $\tau \rho \iota \sigma \sigma o-$ ) $=$ tri-ta-ya-; k'aturtha- and turiya- (4th $)=\left(k^{\prime} a\right)$ turîya-, perhaps for $\left(k^{\prime} a\right)$ turtiya $a$, the second $t$ being thrown out to distinguish this form more completely from tritiya-, unless $y a$-is used here by itself instead of ta-ya-; pañk'ama-, Ved. pañk'atha- (5th); shasltha- (6th), saptuma-, Ved. saptatha- (7th), ashtama(8th), navama- (9th), das'ama- (10th).* In the numerals compounded with das'an final -an is lost, and the suffix $a$ - added ; thus we have êkâdas'a-(11!th), \&c. The cardinal stems end-

* Lottner considers that the ordinals, Skr. saptama-, ashtama-, nava-ma-, das'ama-, Gr. $\dot{\varepsilon} \delta \delta \rho \rho_{0}-$, L. septimo-, decimo-, \&c., are formed simply by the addition of $a$ to the cardinal stems, saptam, ashtam, \&c.
ing in $-t i$ or $-t$ either add -tama or $-a$; in the latter case vin's'ati and the numerals ending in $-t$ lose $t$-with the preceding vowell, while shashti, saptati, asîti, and navati only lóse final $i$ : thuis vins'àtitama- or vins'a- (20th) ; trins'attama- or trins' $a$ (30th) ; k'atvà̀rins'attama- or k'atvâriñs'a- (40th) ; pañnk'âs'attamá or pañk'âs'a- (50th); shasltuitama- or shashtáa- (60th), \&et- From s'ata and sahasra we have s'atatama- (100th), sa-hasratama- ( 1000 th $)$.

In Greek we have $\pi \rho \omega \tau 0-$ (1st), Dor. $\pi \rho a \pi o-$, Ep. $\pi \rho о \mu о-$,





 каıঠкато-, теєто- кає ঠєкато- (13th), \&c.; вікобто- (20th); тойкобто- (30th); тєббаракобто-, Dor. тєгрюкобто- (40th),
 $-\sigma \tau o$ is, perhaps, connected with the superlative ending -ioro, initial $\iota$ being lost. The same ending is found in čacro二, побто-, втобто-.

In Latin we have primo- (1st) for pro-imo-, according to Curtius, or for pris-mo-, according to Pott, pris being for prius; secundo-(2nd), from R. sequi (to follow), whence séquor ; tertio- (3rd) ; quarto- (4th), for quatiorto-; quinto- (5th), for quincto-; sexto- (6th); septimo- (7th); octavo- (8th), from ${ }_{o c t a v}=\mathrm{I}$. E. aktâv; nono- (9th), for novimo-, $m$ being assimilated to the preceding $n$; decimo- (10th); ; undecino- (11th); duodecimo- (12th) ; tertio- decimo (13th), \&e.; vigesimo-, vi-cesimo-, (20th), for vicensimo- = viéent-timo - ; trigesimo-, tri-cesimo- (30th), for tricensimo- $=$ tricent-timo-, \&c.; centesimo(100th) following the analogy of the preceding decades, \&c.; millesimo- ( 1000 th ).

## CHAPTER XI.

§. 162. Pronouns.

In the pronouns of the first and second person we find no distinction of gender in any of the Indo-European languages.* This may be accounted for by supposing that they were developed at a period preceding the introduction of this distinction, as is probable, for they express ideas that are among the first to suggest themselves to man. Their antiquity also accounts for the fact, that there is such a variety in the different pronominal roots employed to express these ideas, and also for the fact that these pronominal roots have become so disguised in various ways, that it is impossible to analyze the greater portion of them, and consequently impossible to reproduce the original Indo-European forms from which they are derived. $\dagger$

No distinction of gender is found also in the reflexive pronoun ; all the other pronouns have three genders.

No vocative case is found in the pronouns.
In Sanskrit in all the pronouns the real stem is not used in compounds, but in the pronouns of the first and second person the abl. sing. or pl. is used, and in the others the nom. sing. neut.
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## §. 163. T'he Pronoun of the First Person.

The stem of this pronoun was originally ma-, connected either with the I. E. verbal root $m a$ (to think), whence Skr. man (id.), or with the pronominal root $m a$ - (this), whence Skr. $i$-ma- (id.). $\quad M a$ is of universal occurrence in the verbal inflexion, as in Skr. as-mi (I am), i-ma-s (we go), \&c.; Gr. $\varepsilon i ँ-\mu,{ }^{i}-\mu \varepsilon \cdot \nu, \& c . ;$ L. su-m, $i-m u-s, \& c$.

Beside the stem $m a$ - we also find in Indo-European a stem $\operatorname{agham}(\alpha-)$, whence Skr. aham (I.), or $\operatorname{agam}(a)$, whence Goth. $i k$ (I.), Gr. $\dot{\gamma} \gamma \dot{\omega}$. As $m a$ - has been connected with the verbal root $m a$ (to think), so $\operatorname{agam}(a-)$, from which, after the separation of the European branches of the Indo-European from the Asiatic, the Sanskrit agham, and finally aham, was developed, has been derived from the I. E. verbal root ag (to move),* whence Skr. $a g^{\prime}$ (id.), Gr. ä $\gamma \omega$, \&c.: agam- $a$ would then be divided thus: $a g$ (a verbal root) $+a$ - (a pronominal demonstrative root) $+m a$ - (the preceding stem of $I$ ). Bopp, however, considers that in Skr. aham an initial $m$ has been lost, and supposes that the first portion of the word is merely the stem $m a$-(I.).

The other explanation, suggested by Bopp, is much preferable to either of the preceding, viz.: that the initial $\alpha$ - is

* In this case agama-would mean "I the mover," and hence " I," as the first idea we have of $a$ mover, a cause, is derived from the power we have of willing. The I. E. root ag also meant "to speak," whence Skr. $a h$ (which also passed through the stage $a g h$ ) ; L. $a d$ - $a g-i u m, ~ a j o=a g-i o$, Goth. af-aik-a (I deny); and here agama- would mean "I the speaker." Although it is possible that both forms of this stem, agama- and aghama-, existed in Indo-European, it is nevertheless more probable that aham is a special Sanskrit form developed from agama-, through the stage aghama-. We find a few other examples of a Skr. $h$ being = an I. E. $g$; thus we have Skr. hanu-s (the jaw), Gr. $\gamma^{\dot{\varepsilon} \nu v-s, ~ L . ~ g e n a, ~ G o t h . ~ k i n n u-s ; ~ S k r . ~}$ maha-t (great), Gr. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon} \gamma \alpha-\varsigma$, Goth. mikil-s.
the demonstrative stem * $a$ - (this). $\quad A$-ga-ma- (or $a$-gha-ma-) would then be resolved into the three pronominal stems, $a$ (this); ga- (or gha-), which is connected with Ved. ghâ, gha, hâ; Skr. ha, Gr. $\gamma \varepsilon, \gamma a$ (in Dor. ${ }^{\prime} \gamma \omega \nu \gamma a$, Bœot. " ${ }^{\prime} \omega \nu \gamma a$ ); Goth. $-k$ in the acc.s sing. mik (me), thuk (te), sik (se), O. H. G. - $k$ in the acc.s pl. unsil (nos), iwilh (vos), and ma- (the other stem of the first person).


## Nominative Singular.

Ind.-Eur. : agam (a-). $\dagger$
Skr. : aham.
 $i \omega v \gamma a$. Here $\omega=\mathrm{I}$. E. c̆, but the cause of this change is unknown.
L. : eg $\bar{o}$ (with $\bar{o}$ as in Greek), and later egŏ.

* So in the Sanskrit Dramas we find ayañ g'anah (lit. this person) used to express the first personal pronoun. Compare also the use of $L$. hic, and of this in vulgar English.
+ Lottner (in the essay quoted in p . 315) considers that there were two periods in prehistorical Indo-European times: firstly, a period when $M$ was solely the characteristic of the first person ; secondly, a period when $M$ became restricted to the oblique cases of the singular. Both periods had been gone through before our ancestors separated. "In the historical times," he writes, "the difference of singular and plural, and of the nominative ' $I$,' as opposed to the oblique case $M e$ is, upon the whole, preserved; but here and there we observe a tendency to come back to the preprimitive-if I may say so-simplicity." . . . . The tendency, that $M$ has to return to the nom. sing. we find "in some of the English dialects which partly replace $I$ by me, in the moi of the French, in the men of the New Persian . . . . in the mé of the Old Irish." . . . . "Secondly, we find the $m$ of the first person extended to the plural. This we have in some German and Norse dialects (mer, mir for wir is common about Thuringia ; mer is also sometimes used in Old Norse), in the New Iranian languages almost throughout ( $w e$ is in New Persian mâ, Armenian meq, Ossetian $m a_{\chi}$ ), and in Modern Greek $\mu \varepsilon \tilde{i}_{s}$." I have observed similar phenomena in the Italian dialect of San Remo.


## Accusative Singular.

Ind.-Eur. : mă-m.
Skr.: mâ-m, mâ. Mâm in form is a fem. acc. Bopp suggests either that $\hat{a}$ was first developed in $m \hat{a}$ to compensate for the loss of the final $m$, and that it was borrowed by mâm from $m \hat{a}$, or that mâm is for ma-ha-m, $h a$ being = Gr. $\gamma \varepsilon$.

L.: $m \bar{e}$ for $m e m=\operatorname{mim}$ from stem $m i$-, final $\bar{e}$ being lengthened to compensate for loss of $m$. In Old Latin med was used for me, as in Novios Plautios med Romai fecid (C.I. L. I. n. 54). Mehe was also written in Old Latin for me. Bücheler suggests that mehe may be $=$ Gr. $\grave{£} \mu \varepsilon \gamma^{\gamma} \varepsilon$, Goth mik.

## Instrumental Singular.

Ind.-Eur. : ——
Skr.: $m a y \hat{a}=m a+i+\hat{a}=m a+a+\hat{a}$.

## Dative Singular.

Ind.-Eur.: ma-bhyam.
Skr.: ma-hyam.

L. : mi-hei, mi-hi, from St. mi-; U. me-he.

Ablative Singular.
Ind.-Eur.: ma-d or ma-t. ${ }^{-}$
Skr. : ma-t, Ved. mama-t, a reduplicated form.
L. : $m \bar{e}$, O. L. $m \bar{e}-d$ from St. $m i$ -

Genitive Singular.
Ind.-Eur. : $\qquad$ ?
Skr. : mama, a reduplication of stem, with loss of caseending.


 $\varsigma$ appears to be added to the old genitive.

## Locative Singular.

Ind.-Eur. : ma-i.
Skr.: $m a y i=m a+i+i=m a+a+i$, the stem $m a-$ being lengthened by $a$, as in the instrumental. Skr. mê which is used for gen. and dat. sing. is properly a loc.; compare s'ivê, loc. of s'iva.

L. : Bopp considers gen. mei to be a loc. $=$ me $\check{-} \breve{\iota}=$ mǎ̌$=$ Skr. mayi.

## Nominative Plural.

Ind.-Eur.: the stem of this case was probably formed by adding sma- to the demonstrative stems $m a-, a$-, $v a$-; consequentlyit may have appeared in the forms masma-, asma-, vasma-. Initial $m$ is found in Lith. mēs, O. Sl. $m u ̈$, Arm. meq $\dot{q}$; initial $v$ in Skr. vayam, Goth. veis (E. $w e)$; initial $a$ in Ved. asmê. Bopp considers that Skr. vayam is for mayam, and that $v$ represents an original $m$. This is possible, for initial $m$ and $v$ are sometimes interchanged; thus we find* Basque maguina from L. vagina, Sp . mimbre from L. vimen, Sp. milano from L. villus. In Pâli we find mayam (we) from Skr. vayam. In all these cases, however, $v$ is older than $m$, so that it is just as likely that $m$ is derived from $v$, as $v$ from $m$ (consult §. 95, p. 187).
Skr.: vayam $=v a+i+a m=v a+a+a m$; Ved. asmê; Pâli mayam, amhê.

* Diez, "Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen," vol. I., pp. 250, 357.

Gr. : $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon i ̃ s$ from St. $\dot{\eta} \mu \ell-$ (not from $\dot{\eta} \mu o^{-}=$Ved. asma-, for then the nom. pl. would be $\dot{\eta} \mu o \iota$ ), Æol. 削 $\mu \varepsilon \varepsilon$, Dor. $\dot{a} \mu \varepsilon_{\varsigma}$, Ion. $\hat{\eta} \mu \varepsilon_{\varepsilon}^{\prime} \varsigma(-\varepsilon i \check{ }$
L.: nōs; nōs is, perhaps, an old accusative used as a nom., and follows the analogy of equōs from equo-. Bopp, however, considers that the final $s$ here belongs to the stem, as it occurs in nos-ter, and accordingly he connects it with -sma, from which he also derives -me-t in egomet, memet, tumet, nosmet, and -mmo in immo* $=i s m o$ from St. $i-$. The final $s$ of Skr. năs is also considered by Bopp to belong to the stem, as it is used for the acc. dat. and gen. pl., and is explained in the same way. In Z. nâo = nâs we find the vowel lengthened, as in L. nōs. Nōs may be connected with the pronominal root $n a$-, as has been already suggested in §. 95 , or it may be derived from $m a$-, as initial $m$ and $n$ are sometimes interchanged : thus we find It. nespolo from L. mespilum, nicchio from L. mitulus; Sp. nespera and nispola from L. mespilum, marfil from Arab. nabfll, mueso from L. noster, mastuerzo from L. nasturtuim, naguela from L. magalia, O. Sp. nembrar from L. memorare; Fr. nappe from L. mappa, natte from L. matta, nèfle from L. mespilum; Wall. nalbȩ from L. malva. $\dagger$

## Accusative Plural.

Ind.-Eur. : asma-ns and ma-ns.
Skr.: asmân =asma-ns and năs = ma-ns. Schleicher considers that nas is for ma-sma-ns, initial $m$ becoming $n$ through dissimilation on account of following $m$.
Gr.: ì $\mu \tilde{\mu} \varsigma$, Ion. $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon ́ a s$ from St. $\dot{\eta} \mu \iota$; Жol. ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \mu \varepsilon$, Dor.

[^102]$\dot{a} \mu^{\dot{\varepsilon}}$, either following the analogy of acc. sing. $\mu \dot{\varepsilon}$, or being the mere stem for $\dot{a} \mu \mu \iota-, \dot{a} \mu \iota-$.
L. : nōs.

## Instrumental Plural.

Ind.-Eur. : asma-bhis.
Skr.: asmâ-blis.

## Dative Plural.

Ind.-Eur.: asma-bhyams.
Skr. : asma-bhyam, nas, Ved. asma-bhya.
Gr. : ì $\mu \imath \imath \nu$, Eol. ${ }^{\alpha} \mu \mu \iota \nu$, ä $\mu \mu \iota$; Dor. $\dot{a} \mu i \nu$; ( $\left.-\iota \nu=-\imath-\phi \iota \nu\right)$.
L.: nō-bis perhaps for nos-bis, nos appearing as the stem, as in nos-ter.

## Ablative Plural.

Ind.-Eur. : ?
Skr. : asma- $t$, following analogy of abl. sing.
L. : nō-bis.

## Genitive Plural.

- Ind.-Eur. : ——

Skr. : asmâkam, properly an adjective in acc. sing. neuter ; Ved. asmâka, with loss of final $m$; nas.
Gr. : $\dot{\eta} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$, Ion. $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon ́ \omega \nu, \mathrm{Ep}$. $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon i ́ \omega \nu$ from St. $\dot{\eta} \mu \iota^{-}$, Eol. $\dot{a} \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ \omega \nu$, Bœot. $\dot{a} \mu i ́ \omega \nu$, Dor. $\dot{a} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu, \dot{a} \mu \dot{\varepsilon} \omega \nu$.
L. : nostrum, gen. pl. of possessive stem nostro-, for nostrorum, which occurs in Plautus ; nostri, gen. sing. of the same stem. Some writers consider nostrum to be an acc. sing. neuter.

Locative Plural.
Ind.-Eur. : asma-sva.
Skr. : asmâ-su.
Gr. : Æol. ä $\mu \mu \varepsilon-\sigma \iota \nu$.

Nominative and Accusative Dual.
Ind.-Eur. : ?
Skr.: $\hat{a} v a ̂ m$ from St. $\hat{a} v a-=\hat{a}+t v a-(I+t h o u)$, according to Bopp, or $=\hat{a}+d v a-(I+$ numeral two $)$ according to Schleicher, as in Old Lith. vedu (m.), vedvi (f.) ; New Lith. mùdu (m.), mùdvi (f.); and Goth. vi-t (we two). We also find as acc. nâu, for nâs according to Bopp, a lengthened form of pl. năs. Nâu is also used for gen. and dat., and therefore $-\hat{\alpha} u$ belongs probably to the stem; it corresponds to Gr. $\nu \dot{\omega}$ in which $\omega$ also appears to belong to the stem (c. f. Skr. ashtêu $=$ Gr. $\dot{o} \kappa \tau \notin \dot{\prime})$. In form nâu is a regular acc. dual of St. na-, as s'ivâu from s'iva-.
Gr.: ข$̈ \ddot{\omega}, \nu \omega$; Bœot. $\nu \tilde{\omega} \varepsilon$.

## Instrumental and Ablative Dual.

Ind.-Eur. : $\qquad$ ?

Skr.: âvâbhyâm.

## Dative Dual.

Ind.-Eur.: ——
Skr. : $\hat{a} v a ̂ b h y a ̂ m, ~ n a ̂ u . ~$
Gr. : $\nu \tilde{\omega} і ̈ \nu, \nu \tilde{\varphi} \nu$.
Genitive Dual.
Ind.-Eur. : —?
Skr.: âvayôs, nâu.
Gr. : $\nu \tilde{\omega} \boldsymbol{\imath} \nu, \nu \underset{\varphi}{\nu} \nu$.
Locative Dual.
Ind.-Eur.: ?
Skr.: âvayôs.
§. 164. The Pronoun of the Second Person.

## Nominative Singular.

Ind.-Eur. : tvam for $t a^{*}+v a+m a$ (see §. $95, \mathrm{p} .187$ )
Skr. : tvam.
Gr.: $\tau \dot{v}$, Dor. $\tau v ́, ~ B œ o t . ~ \tau o u ́ v ~(=~ Z . ~ t u ̂ m), ~ \tau o v ́, ~ \tau u ́ v \eta, ~$ Lacon. тv́vŋ.
L. : $t u$.

## Accusative Singular.

Ind.-Eur. : tva-m.
Skr.: tvâm, tvâ, which Bopp explains in the same way as mâm, mâ.
Gr. : $\sigma \varepsilon ́$, Dor. $\tau \dot{\varepsilon}, \tau v, \tau \varepsilon ์ \iota$; Cret. $\tau \rho \varepsilon ́$, Bœot. $\tau i \nu$.
L. : tē for tvem, from St. tvi-; O. L. ted (an ablatival form used as an accusative by Plautus), U. tiom for tuom =tvam; or, according to Corssen, for tvio-m from St. tvi- lengthened by $a$.

* Lottner (in his essay quoted in p. 315) remarks, that "whatever the actual nature of the Thou may be, it cannot be overlooked, that in a mere abstract metaphysical point of view it is but one of the many cases of the non-ego, and that therefore it is not altogether unreasonable to expect that language should treat it as such; in other words, that the pronoun of the second person should somehow be a variety-strongly marked indeed by individual characteristics-of the pronoun of the third person."

Thus in the Indo-Eur. languages $t a$ is the stem of Skr. $t a-m$ (eum), Gr. $\tau o ́ v$, L. (is-) tum, Sl. tŭ, Goth. thana, O. H. G. den, \&c.

Also in the Semitic languages the stem of the second person is either tha or ta, to which the syllable an or en is prefixed, and this same tha or $t a$ with the same prefix an or en is also used as the stem of the pronoun of the third person. Thus we have Egyptian ento- $k$ (thou, m.), Coptic entho-k (thou, m.), \&c., beside Egyptian ento-f (he), Coptic entho-f, \&c.

Those writers who derive the pronouns from verbal roots connect tvam with I. E. $\tan$ (to stretch).

Instrumental Singular.
Ind.-Eur.: $\qquad$
Skr. : $\operatorname{tvay} \hat{a}=t v a+i+\hat{a}=t v a+a+\hat{a}$.
Dative Singular.
Ind.-Eur. : tva-bhyam.
Skr. : tu-bhyam, Ved. tu-bhya.
Gr.: Hom. $\tau \varepsilon i ้ \nu$, Dor. $\tau i v$, Tarent. $\tau i \nu \eta$.
L. : tibi (final $m$ being lost, as in Ved. tubhya); U. tefe.

Ablative Singular.
Ind.-Eur. : tva-d or tva-t.
Skr.: tva-t.
L.: tē, O. L. tēd from St. ti-.

Genitive Singular.
Ind.-Eur. : ——
Skr. : tava for tvatva, a reduplication of stem, with loss of case ending.
Gr. : $\sigma o \hat{v}$, Ion. $\sigma \varepsilon ์ o, ~ \sigma \varepsilon \hat{v}$; Ep. $\sigma \varepsilon i ̃ o, ~ \tau \varepsilon o i ̃ o ~(=t a v a-s y a), ~ D o r . ~$
 ri $\omega_{s}$, the gen. case-ending $s$ appears to be added to the old genitive.
L. : tui, the gen. sing of the possessive stem tuo-.

Locative singular.
Ind.-Eur. : tva-i.
Skr. : tvayi $=t v a+i+i=t v a+a+i$. Skr. tê, Ved. tvê, which is used for dat. and gen. sing. is properly a locative.
Gr. : $\sigma o-i$, Dor. то-í.

## Nominative Plural.

Ind.-Eur. : tvasma- was probably the stem.
Skr. : ŷ̂yam for $t v a+i+a m=t v a+a+a m$; Ved. yushmê; Pâli tumhê (= tus-mê).
 จن์ $\mu \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon$, Ion. $\dot{v} \mu \varepsilon ́ \varepsilon \varepsilon$.
L. : vōs (compare nōs).

## Accusative Plural.

Ind.-Eur. : tvasmă-ns or tvă-ns.
Skr. : yushmân = tvasmăns, Ved. yushmâs (f.); vas = tvăns.
 (compare ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \varepsilon, \& c$.).

Instrumental Plural.
Ind.-Eur. : tvasma-bhis.
Skr. : yushmâ-bhis.
Dative Plural.
Ind.-Eur. : tvasma-bhyams.
Skr.: yushma-bhyam, vas.
Gr. : $\dot{v} \mu i ̈ \nu=\dot{v} \mu t-\phi \iota \nu$, Æol. ${ }^{v} \mu \mu \iota$, vै $\mu \mu \iota \nu$; Bœot. ov $\mu i ̄ \nu$. L.: vō-bis (compare nō-bis).

Ablative Plural.
Ind.-Eur.: ——
Skr-: yushma-t (compare asma-t).
L. : nō-bis.

Genitive Plural.
Ind.-Eur.: —?
Skr. : yushmâkam, Ved. yushmâka; vas.
Gr. : $\dot{v} \mu \tilde{\omega} \nu$, Ion. $\dot{v} \mu \varepsilon \varepsilon \omega \nu$, Ep. $\dot{v} \mu \varepsilon i ́ \omega \nu$ from St. $\dot{v} \mu \iota-$ © $\dot{v} \mu \mu \varepsilon ́ \omega \nu$, Bœot. ov́ $\boldsymbol{i} \omega \nu$.
L. : vostrorum, vostrum (ves-), vostri (ves-).

## Locative Plural.

Ind.-Eur.: tvasma-sva.
Skr. : yushmâ-su.
Gr. : Æol. ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \varepsilon \sigma \iota \nu$ probably, after analogy of ${ }^{\prime} \mu \mu \varepsilon \sigma \iota \nu$.

Nominative and Accusative Dual.
Ind.-Eur. : ——?
Skr. : yuvâm from St. yuva $=t v a+t v a-$ (thou + thou $)$, or $t v a+d v a$ (thou + numeral two), compare Lith. yì-du (m.), yù-dvi (f.); Ved. yuvăm. We also find as acc. $v a ̂ m$ for vâv (according to Bopp) $=v \hat{a} u=v \hat{a} s$, (compare nâu).
Gr. : $\sigma \phi \bar{\omega} \ddot{\imath}, \sigma \phi \omega^{\prime} .{ }^{*}$
Instrumental and Ablative Plural.
Ind.-Eur. : $\qquad$ ?
Skr.: yurâ-bhyâm. In Vedic we also find yuvat as abl.; compare mat, \&c.

## Dative Dual.

Ind.-Eur.: $\qquad$ ?
Skr.: yuvâ-bhyâm, vâm; Ved. yuva-bhyâm.
Gr.: $\sigma \phi \tilde{\omega} \imath \nu, \sigma \phi \tilde{\varphi} \nu$.
Genitive Dual.
Ind.-Eur. : $\qquad$ ?

Skr. : yuva-yôs, Ved. yuvốs, vâm.
Gr. : $\sigma \phi \ddot{\omega} \boldsymbol{\imath} \nu, \sigma \phi \tilde{\varphi} \nu$.
Locative Dual.
Ind.-Eur.: $\qquad$
Skr. : yuva-yôs.

## §. 165. The Reflexive Pronoun.

There is no distinction of gender in this pronoun, except in Gr. nom. and acc. pl. oфદ́a. The Ind.-Eur. stem was sva-, which in Sanskrit only occurs in compounds, as in sva-yam (self) $=s v a+i+a m=s v a+a+a m$, sva-tas (by one's self),

[^103]sva-dhâ (spontaneity), sva-blû (self-existent), \&c. In Sanskrit the stem sva- is also used as a possessive; Skr. sva-s = Gr.
 $=\sigma F_{\varepsilon}-\tau \eta \varsigma,{ }_{\varepsilon}^{\ell} \theta_{o \varsigma}$ and ${ }_{\eta} \theta_{o \varsigma}=\sigma F_{\varepsilon}-\theta_{o \varsigma}$ (compare Skr. svadh $\hat{a}$ ); Hom. $\phi \dot{\eta}=\sigma \phi \eta$ (initial $\sigma$ being lost, as in Lac. $\phi i \nu=\sigma \phi i \nu$, Lac.
 $\delta \varepsilon \iota \nu=\sigma \phi a \iota \prime \prime \zeta \varepsilon \iota \nu$, Bœot. $\Phi i \xi=\Sigma \phi^{\prime} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \xi$; L. funda beside Gr. $\sigma \phi \varepsilon \nu \delta o ́ v \eta$, L. fǐdes beside Gr. $\sigma \phi i ́ \delta \varepsilon \varsigma$, L. fallo = Gr. $\sigma \phi a ́ \lambda \lambda \omega$, L. $f$ igo $=\mathrm{Gr}$. $\sigma \phi^{\prime} \gamma \gamma \omega$, whence $\phi^{\prime} \mu$ ós $\left.=\sigma \phi \iota-\mu о \varsigma\right)$; and in L . si, si-qua = U. sve-pu, si-ne (?), sed (an ablative form), sē-voco, sed-itio, sĕ-orsum, sue-sco, š̆-dālis (from sodā = Skr. sva-dhâ). Bopp connects -pse in ipse with sva-, $v$ becoming $p$ when transposed, as in Dor. $\psi^{\prime} \nu=\sigma \phi^{\prime} \nu$; but this is wrong, for $i p s e=i$-pte (compare sua-pte), and -pte is, probably, connected with Skr. pati- (master) $=$ Gr. $\pi o \sigma \iota-$, L. pot-is, Lith. pati-s (self).

## Nominative Singular.

This case is not found in Greek and Latin.

## Accusative Singular.

Ind.-Eur. : svă-m.
Gr.: ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\varepsilon}$, Æol. $\mathrm{F}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}=\sigma \mathrm{F} \varepsilon$, Hom. $\mathfrak{\varepsilon}_{\varepsilon}^{\prime}=\sigma \varepsilon \mathcal{F}_{\varepsilon}$, Dor. $\sigma \phi^{\prime}$. Ep. $\mu^{\prime} i \nu$, Dor. $\nu i v$, which are used for $\varepsilon$ !, are, perhaps, for $i \mu-\iota \mu$,* a reduplicated accusative of St. $\iota$; compare the Latin reduplicated accusatives sese, O. L. em-em (eundem).
L. : $s \bar{e}=s v e=s v i-m$ from St. svi, O. L. sed (inter sed in SC de Bac., apud sed in tab. Bant.); Osc. siom $\dagger$ for suom = sva-m. Corssen explains siom as a lengthened form trom St. si- by the addition of $a$, and consequently as $=$ svi-o-m (compare $e-u-m=i-u-m$, Osc. $i-o-n-c$ from St. $i-$ ).
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## Dative Singular.

Ind.-Eur. : sva-bhyam.
Gr. : Bœot. $\varepsilon$ civ (Corinna), Dor. iv, contracted from $=\dot{\varepsilon}-\phi \iota \nu$.
L.: sibi, U. sibe, O. sifei, from St. svi-.

Ablative Singular.
Ind.-Eur. : sva-d or sva-t.
L. : sē, O. L. sēd for seid, from St. svi-.

Genitive Singular.
Ind.-Eur.: ——?
 L.: sui, the gen. sing. of the possessive stem suo-.

Locative Singular.
Ind.-Eur. : sva-i.
Gr. : oũ, Æol. Foĩ, Bœot. Fũ.
Nominative Plural.
Ind.-Eur. : ——
Gr. : $\sigma \phi \varepsilon i \varsigma, \sigma \phi^{\prime}{ }^{\prime} a$ (n.), from St. $\sigma \phi \iota$. Accusative Plural.

Ind.-Eur.: ?
Gr. : $\sigma \phi \bar{a} \varsigma, \sigma \phi^{\prime} a^{\prime}(\mathrm{n}$.$) ; Ion. \sigma \phi^{\prime} a \varsigma, \sigma \phi \varepsilon i a \varsigma$, Dor. $\sigma \phi \varepsilon^{\prime}$, Syrac. $\psi \epsilon ́, \nVdash o l . \alpha{ }^{\prime} \sigma \phi \varepsilon$.
L. : same as in sing.

## Dative Plural.

Ind.-Eur.: sva-bhyams.
Gr. : Dor. $\sigma \phi i \not v$, Syrac. $\psi i ́ \nu$, Lacon. $\phi i v$, Eol. ä $\sigma \phi$.
L. : same as in sing.

Ablative Plural.
Ind.-Eur. : ——?
L. : same as in sing.

## Genitive Plural.

Ind.-Eur.: ——?
Gr. : $\sigma \phi \tilde{\omega} \nu$, Ion. $\sigma \phi \tilde{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, Æol. $\sigma \phi \varepsilon \dot{\epsilon} \omega \nu$, Syrac. $\psi \tilde{\omega} \nu$ and $\tilde{\varepsilon} \omega \nu$. L.: same as in sing.

## Locative Plural.

Ind.-Eur.: sva-sva.
Gr.: $\sigma \phi i-\sigma l$.
Nominative and Accusative Dual.
Ind.-Eur.: $\qquad$ ?
Gr : $\sigma \phi \omega$ ह́, $\sigma \phi \dot{\omega}$.

## Dative and Genitive Dual.

Ind.-Eur.: __?
Gr.: $\sigma \phi \omega i ̀ \nu=\sigma \phi \omega-\phi ı v$.
§. 166. The Pronouns in which the Gender is marked.
An examination of all the pronouns of this class found in each language belongs to the special grammar of each, and we here limit our investigation to the declension of these pronouns, selecting the I. E. demonstrative stem $t a$ as the one of which the declension will be given in full. In the three following sections we merely notice the chief points of difference between the declension of the pronouns and that of the nouns, omitting some exceptions which will be found in the special grammars of each language.

## §. 167. The Sanskrit Pronominal Declension.

The nom. sing. masc. generally ends in $-s$, as in the noun, except in $s a$ (nom. sing. masc.), where the final $s$ was omitted, because it was perhaps a repetition of sa itself. The same omission is found in Goth. sa and Gr. $\boldsymbol{\delta}$. We also find the peculiar nominatives ayam (m.), iyam (f.), which are ana-
logous to the personal pronoun aham;* also the nom. asâu (m. f.), which, perhaps, arose from an older asâs. The nom. and acc. neut. sing. ends in $d$ or $t$, and this form is used as the true stem in compounds. The nom. pl. masc. ends in -ê, which, perhaps, arose from $-a-i-a s=-a-\alpha-a s$, the stem being lengthened by $a$, which afterwards became $i$, and the final as being lost; thus $t \hat{e}=t a-i-a s=t a-a-a s$. In the dat., abl., and loc. sing. the masc. and neut. $a$-stems are lengthened by the addition of sma; and in the same cases the fem. $\hat{a}$ - stems are lengthened by si$(=s m \hat{\imath}$, according to Bopp). The gen. pl. ends in -sâm.

## §. 168. The Greek Pronominal Declension.

The nom. sing. mas. ends in $-s$, as in the noun, except in $\dot{\delta}=$ Skr. sa. The nom. sing. neut. ends in $-\boldsymbol{o}=\boldsymbol{o} \boldsymbol{o \tau}$, final $\boldsymbol{\tau}$ (or $\delta$ ?) being lost. In other respects the pronominal is the same as the nominal declension.

## §. 169. The Latin Pronominal Declension.

Final -s of nom. sing. masc. is sometimes lost, as in ipse (beside ipsus), iste (beside istus), ecqui, siqui, qui (beside $q u i s)=0$. pis, lic. Qui is probably for quoi (whence O. L. $q u e i)=$ U. poi, poei, poe, and lic for hoi-ce, the stems in both cases being lengthened by $-i$. The nom. sing. fem. ends in $-a$ except in que $=0$. pair, hace, illoce (beside illa), istoce (beside ista), the stems of these pronouns being also lengthened by $-i$. Quis is used as a nom. fem. in Plautus (quis mulier est), as Gr. tís. This $-i$ that is added to the stem in qua is of common occurrence, as in U .


[^105]siders that it is also found in the forms $\tau 0 \hat{t}(=\tau o ́), \tau a i ́ t ~(=\tau a ́)$, which occur in the "Foedus Eleorum et Heraeensium," but Ahrens ("de Grecex Linguæ Dialectis," I., p. 280) opposes this view, and considers $\tau o l$ and $\tau a t$ to be for $\tau \psi \ddot{\mu}$ and $\tau \ddot{q}$. The fem. sometimes occurs without this addition, as in aliqua, numqua, siqua $=\mathrm{U}$. svepu. The nom. and acc. sing. neut. are formed by adding $d$ to the stem, as in $i d=0 . i d, q u o d=0$. pidd, quid $=$ O. pid, O. L. alid $=$ aliud, U. pir $(-i)=q u i d, \& c$. In the second century b.c. this $d$ had a very weak sound, and was sometimes almost imperceptible, just as in Gr . $\tau i$ and ${ }_{a}{ }^{2} \lambda \lambda \lambda_{0}$ the suffix vanishes. Beside aliud we find alium (Fabr. 95, 211), as in Gr. тобойтov beside тобойто. Ipsum is neut. of ipse. Hoc, O. L. hoce is for hod-ce. The nom.s pl. masc. and fem. are formed in the same way as in the noun: as in the masc. forms eeis, ieis, eis, ei, ques, quei, qui, heis, hisce, hei, hi, and the fem. que, iste, \&ec. The O. pas ( $=\mathrm{L} . q u c e$ ) is analogous to Skr. nom. pl. fem. The nom. and acc. pl. neut. is the same as in the noun, except in hace, O. L. haice, quce $=0$ pai, istocc (beside ista, illcec (beside illa), where the stems are lengthened by $i$. This $i$ is not found in aliqua and siqua.

The dat.s sing. (m. f. n.) illi, ipsi, toti, alteri $=0$. L. alterei for altero-i, \&c., are, probably, old locatives: such as humi and domi. In the O. L. quoiei we fine the stem lengthened by $i$ and then the true dative suffix $-e i=$ I. E. $-a i$ was added. It is possible that isti, \&c., may have been formed as quoiei, and accordingly that they may have arisen from the true dative forms istoiei, \&c. We also find the dat. sing. masc. ending in -0 , as in nullo usui, in Cæsar, \&c., and the fem. ending in $-\infty$ in Plautus, \&c. In the Umbrian datives $e$-smei, pu-sme, we find the stem lengthened by -sma, as in Sanskrit.

The gen.s sing. istius, \&c., were formed by adding -ius to the stem lengthened by $i:$ istius would then be for isto-i-ius. The ending -ius is supposed by Bopp to have arisen merely by transposition from the gen. ending -sya, but it is much
more probable that isto-i-ius is for isto-i-siu-s, -siu being $=-s y a$, and $-s$ being added, as in the Doric gen. sing. of the first and
 considers istīus, \&c., to have arisen from istī-ius, \&c., istī being the usual genitive in $-i$ and $i$-us, an enclitic genitive of the pronominal stem -i.*

The adverbs hic $=0$. L. heic and qui are old locatives, and $=$ hoi-c and quoi. Similarly in Oscan we find loc. exei-c from pronominal stem exo-. Corssen considers qui to be an ablative form for quei-d; quicum is used for both quocum and quacum.

Beside quorum, gen. pl. of stem quo-, we find cuium as gen. pl. of stem qui (Charisius II., 136).
§. 170. The Declension of the Stem $t a-$ (m. n.)

|  | Skr. | Gr. | L. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Stem. | $t a$ - | то-. | is-to. $\dagger$ |
| Sing. N. | $s a, s a-s$ (m.), $t a-t$ (n.) | $\dot{\boldsymbol{o}}$ (m.) , $\tau \dot{o}$ ( n . $)$ | iste(m.), istu-d (n.) |
| A. | ta-m (m.), ta-t (n.) | $\tau \dot{o}-\nu(\mathrm{m}),. \tau^{\prime} \dot{o}$ ( n ) | istu-m (m.), istu-d <br> (n.) |
| I. | tề-n-a. . | - | - |

* Consult Meunier's Essay "De quelques anomalies que présente la déclinaison de certains Pronoms Latins" ("Mémoires de la Société de Linguistique de Paris." Tome I., pp. 14-62). Beside these genitives in -ius we also find in Old Latin the gen.s ei, quoi, cui,qui, \&c. : as in Ei rei argumenta dicam (Pl. Trin. 522) Quoi fides fidelitasque amicum erga aquiperet tuam (Pl. Trin. 1126), Perii quot hic ipse annos vivet, cui filii tam diu vivont (Pl. Mil. 1081), \&c. In Plautus Pers. 83, Meunier reads Set eccum parasitum quoi mi ius auxiliost opus, and considers that here we find existing separately the two genitives (quoi from stem quo-, and ius from stem $i$-), which afterwards coalesced into quoius.

The dative quoiei (which occurs on the fourth inscription on the tomb of the Scipios, Qvoiei vita defecit, non honos, honoreis), is, according to Meunier, a double locative from quoi loc. of quo-, and ei loc. of $i$-. Similarly the dat. eiei (as in Lucr. III., 555, Sive aliud quidvis potius connexius eiei) is a double loc. of $i$-.
$\dagger$ L. is-to- is compounded of the three stems $i$-, $s a$ - and $t a$-. In addition to the declension of isto- I also give some other pronominal forms to illustrate the original declension of the pronouns.

|  | Skr. | Gr. | L. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D. | $t a-s m a i$. | $\tau \underline{\%}$. | $i s t \overline{\text {, U }}$, pu-sme. |
| Ab. | $t a-s m a ̂-t$. | $\tau \omega_{\varsigma}=\tau \omega-\tau$. | istō-d. |
| G . | ta-sya. | то-ĩo, т0ข̃. | istūus. |
| L. | $t a-s m$-in. | - | - |
| Plur. N. | $t e ̂(m),. t \hat{a}-n-i$ (n.) | тoí, oi (m.), тá (n.) | $i s t \overline{,}$ U. pur-e (m.) |
| - |  | - | ista, qua-e (n.) |
| A. | $t a-n(\mathrm{~m}),. t a-n-i(\mathrm{n}$. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { тóvs, тои́s (m.), т } \dot{a} \\ & \text { (n.) } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { istō-s (m.), ista } \\ \text { (n.) } \end{gathered}$ |
| I. | tais. | - | - |
| D. Ab . | tê-bhyas. | - | istizs. |
| Plur. G. | tê-sham. | $\tau \tilde{\nu} \nu$. | istō-rum. |
| L. | tê-shu. | то亢̃-бı, тоi¢. | - |
| Dual. N. A. | $t a ̂ u, t a$ (m.), tê (n.) | т ${ }^{\text {co. }}$ | - |
| I. D. Ab. | $t a-b h y a m$. | то-ธั. | - |
| G. L. | $t a-y$-ôs | - | - |

§. 171. The Declension of the Stem tâ- (f.).

Skr.
Stem. tâ.
Sing. N.
A. $\quad t a-m$.
I. $\quad t a-y-\hat{a}$.
D. ta-sy-âi.

Ab. $\quad t a-s y-\hat{c} s$.
G. ta-sy- $\hat{s}$.
L. $\quad t a-s y-a ̂ m$.

Plur. N.
A. ta-s.
I. tâ-bhis.
D. Ab. tâ-bhyas.
G. tâ-sûm.
L. tâ-su.

Dual. N. A. tê.
I. D. Ab. tâ-bhyam.
G. L. $\quad t a-y$-ôs.

Gr.
$\tau \alpha$ -
$\dot{\eta}$.
$\tau \dot{a}-\nu, \tau \dot{\eta}-\nu$.
$\tilde{\eta}^{\boldsymbol{\eta}}$ - $\phi$ 。
$\tau \pi$.

| - | istā- $d$. |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\tau \tilde{\eta}-\varsigma$. | istīus. |

тai, ai. ista, 0. pa-s.
( $\tau \dot{\alpha}-\nu \varsigma), \tau \dot{\alpha}-\varsigma . \quad$ istā-s.
$\tau \bar{y}-\sigma t, \tau a i ̃ s$.
т .́.
$\tau \alpha-i ̃ \nu$.
istīs.
istā-rum.
L. is-ta-. ista, qua-e. ista-m. -
istī.
istā-d. istīus.

sta-
-
—
-
$\qquad$

## APPENDIX.

## The Sanskrit Cerebrals or Linguals.

Dr. George Bünler, in his essay "On the Origin of the Sanskrit Linguals," has attempted to demonstrate that these sounds were not borrowed from the Dravidian races of India, but that they were for the most part developed within the limits of the Sanskrit. As Bühler's essay is very instructive, I have condensed his chief arguments in this Appendix, and frequently employed his own words.*

The borrowing of sounds by one language from another is a phenomenon that has never been proved to have occurred in languages that have been influenced by others in historical times. Thus, take the case of English; though it was under Norman influence for so many centuries, and though traces of that influence are seen on all sides in borrowed words, loss of the old Saxon inflexions, \&c., yet not a single Norman sound was introduced into it. Neither the French $a$ nor $u$ nor nasals were adopted by the English; and it is just as difficult for an Englishman of the nineteenth century to pronounce these sounds as it was for a Saxon of the tenth century. But the case of such nations as the Irish, the Germanised Sclavonians, \&c., demonstrate the same fact still more manifestly; for, while these nations have almost completely lost their original language, and adopted that of their conquerors, they still retain their native sounds, and have adapted their new language to them. $\dagger$

* Bühler of course is not responsible for all the examples and comparisons adduced here.
+ Thus the initial sound heard in the Irish pronunciation of E. car is not $k y$, as is commonly supposed, but the bard aspirate $k h$, which, with the other hard aspirates, is still found in Irish.

Moreover, before we can assert that the Skr. cerebrals are borrowed from the Dravidian languages, we must prove that the conditions under which alone sounds can be borrowed, existed in the case of Skr.; i. e. we must prove that a great many foreign words containing the sound in question were first borrowed and that thus the new sound became perfectly familiar to the people. Therefore it has first to be demonstrated that Sanskrit in very early times already possessed, as loans, a number of Dravidian words containing these cerebrals. Dr. Caldwell, who strongly supports the theory of the Dravidian origin of these sounds, enumerates only sixteen nouns containing cerebrals which he supposed to have been borrowed. Only two of these, âni (the pin of the axle of a cart), and katuka (sharp), are found in the Rigveda, and even these can be easily deduced from ordinary Sanskrit roots. Ạni is for arni, from R. ar (to fit); and consequently may mean "a thing to be fitted (into some other thing"), compare ara (a spoke); katu (sharp) is for kartu from krt (to eut). Even supposing that these sixteen words were borrowed, they would be far too few in number to cause the introduction into Sanskrit of the cerebral sounds which they contain.

As Zend, however, contains three cerebrals, the consonantal and vocalized $r$ and $s h$, and as it can be shown that nearly all the Skr. cerebral mutes and nasal are produced by the direct change of $r$ and sh into them, or by the change of dentals into the corresponding cerebrals through the influence of $r, r$ and $s h$, we must surely infer that cerebralization is not due to the influence of foreign tongues, but solely due to the genius of the language itself. As proof of this, we have the following facts:-

A dental $n$ is frequently changed into $n$, when it is immediately succeeded by a vowel or $y$ or $v$, under the influence of a preceding $r, \hat{r}, r$ or $s h$, provided no palatal, cerebral, dental, sibilant, or $l$ intervene; thus l'ikirsha with suffix mana forms k'ikirshamâna, bhrahmânan comes from bhrahman, \&c.* Anadvah (an ox) is for anarvah, from anas (a cart), and $v a h$ (to draw); the change of -as into ar be-

[^106]fore a soft consonant is found in the Vedas as usharbudh（early awake） for later ushóbudh，vanargu（a thief）for vanógu．$R$ ，when followed by $n$ ，is assimilated to it sometimes in Sanskrit and always in Prakrit．In Sanskrit the first of these $n$＇s may be dropped，and the preceding vowel lengthened，as dûnấs＇a（imperishable）for and beside durṇas＇a， dûnas＇a（difficult to obtain）for and beside durnus＇a．Pani（the hand） ＝parnii from $p r$ ．（to fill）．Añu（small）$=$ arñu from I．E．ar （to hurt，grind），whence Skr．arus（n．a wound），and Gr．ả̀＇є́（I grind），ä $\lambda \epsilon v \rho o \nu *$（flour）；anu would accordingly mean literally ＂ground down．＂Pan（to buy）is for parn from pr（to fill）be－ side Gr．$\pi \epsilon ́ \rho \nu \eta \mu \iota, \pi \dot{\rho} \rho \nu \eta$（cf．Skr．panya－strî），$\pi \rho i a \mu a t$ ，\＆c．；the obscure bannig＇or vanig＇（a merchant）may be connected with this root．Bühler illustrates this change of $p$ into $b$ or $v$ by pibami or pivami（I drink） for $p \hat{a}$ and sphavaya for sphapaya，the causal of spháy（to swell）． We also find vishtapa（a world）for and beside pishtapa，vana and bâna（an arrow）beside parna（a leaf，a feather）．

In Prâkrit，Pâli，and the modern vernaculars，mute dentals have become cerebrals through the influence of $r$ ．Thus Skr．talaurnta （a leaf of a palm tree，a fan），vrddha（old），krta（made），bhartá （nom．sing．a husband），gardabha－s（nom．sing．an ass），\＆c．，become respectively talaventa，vudha，kata，or kita，bhattd，gaddaho，\＆c． This influence of $r$ shows itself even in Vedic as in dûdhi for durdhi， luta for krta，\＆c．In Classical Sanskrit we find many similar ex－ amples，as nâtaka（a dancer）for and beside nartaka；bhata（a sol－ dier），derived by Benfey from bhar，and therefore being for bharta； bhatakia（wages）for bhartaka ；vata（a circle，rope）for varta from vrt （to turn），cf．L．verto ；patta（a table，seat），from patra，according to Benfey；paṭu（skilful）from pat（to divide），for part，．cf．L．

[^107]$\operatorname{par}(t)-s$; vata (an enclosure) for varta, from $v r$ (to enclose), cf. L. vallum; kantaka (a thorn) for karntaka, according to Benfey, from krt (to cut); tata (horizon, bank of a river, mountain) for tarta from $t r$ (to cross), as para* (ripa opposita) comes from par (to
 tard, with which Bopp connects Goth. (us-)thrut (molestiam facere); tadit (fulmen), tandula (granum frumenti, præcipue oryzæ) from tad ; path (to recite) from prath (to celebrate), cf. L. inter-pretari; Benfey, however, considers it to be a demonstrative derived from pashta for spaskta (evident); purodads'a (a cake made of rice meal, offered to the gods) from dâs' (to make oblations). In these two last examples the dental is influenced by $r$, although a vowel intervenes. Bühler considers that a dental has become a cerebral in the following cases through the influence of a succeeding $r$; $k^{\prime} a n d a$ (flaming, passionate)for $k^{\prime} a n d r a \dagger$ (the moon, glowing); danda (a stick) for dantra from dam (to coerce, tame), and tra (a suffix signifying the instrument) ; mêtha (an elephant-driver) beside mahâmatra (id.).
$S h$, when it is original or a substitute for $k^{\prime} h, g^{\prime}, s^{\prime}, k s$, becomes $t$, whenever it ends a word or precedes either the termination ( $-s u$ ) of the loc. pl or hard consonants except $t$, $t h$, and $s$ : while before a soft consonant it becomes $d$, and if $d$ or $d h$ immmediately follow, then these become $d$ or $d h$ respectively. $\ddagger$ Thus we have from the stems dvish (hating), rag' (a king), vis' (entering), viviksh (desirous to enter) $=v i v i k s, p r a k^{\prime} h$ (asking), nis' (night), as nom. sing. dvit, rat, vit, vivit, prat, nit ; as instr. pl. dvidbhis, raddbhis, vidbhis, vividbhis, prâdbhis, nidbhis; and as loc. pl. dvitsu, râtsu, vitsu, vivitsu, pratsu, nitsu. We have also such verbal forms as dviddhi (2 sing. imper. Par.) from dvish (to hate), diddhvam (ye ruled) from $\varepsilon 8^{\prime}$ (to rule), \&c. We find one of the soft cerebrals formed in accordance with this rule sometimes rejected, and then a preceding $a$

[^108]becomes $o$, and $i$ or $u$ becomes $\hat{\imath}$ or $\hat{u}$. Thus shódas'an (sixteen) $=$ shash (six) + das'an (ten), shodha (sixfold) $=$ shash + dha, shodant (a young ox with six teeth $)=$ shash + dant. Nîdha $(\mathrm{a}$ nest $)=$ nishd $a=$ $n i+s a d a$ (what lies under) ; pîd (to press) $=p i s h d=a p i+s a d$ (to sit upon). Again, $n$ becomes $n$ when preceded by $s h$ under the same conditions as when preceded by $r, r$ or $\hat{r}$, as has already been remarked. Lastly, when $\overline{s h}$ immediately precedes a hard dental, it changes it into the corresponding cerebral, as dvêshtum (to hate, infin.), dvêshti (he hates), dvishtha (ye hate), dvishta (hated), ushtha (ye desire) from $v a s^{\prime}$, ashttau (eight) for $a s^{\prime} t d u$ from an original aktâu = L. octo, shashtha (sixth), shashta (sixtieth), \&c. In a few cases s after $a$ becomes $s h$, and then changes a following $t$ or $t h$ into $t$ or $t h$, thus from ava and stambh (to prop) we get avashtambha (relying on), avashtabhnati (he supports himself), ashadha (the old name of a month, partly June and partly July, or a staff carried in that month by an ascetic), $g^{\prime}$ athara (the belly) for gastara beside Gr. శaбтíp.
$H$ can also become a cerebral and change a neighbouring dental into a cerebral: thus we have from St. lih (licking) we have lit (nom. sing.), lidbhis (instr. pl.), litsu (loc. pl.): from lih (to lick) we have lêdhi (he licks), l̂̂dha (licked), lîdhvê (ye licked); from ruh (to grow) we have rôdhum (to grow, infin.) rûdha (grown), \&c.

Cerebrals also arise from the assimilative force of neighbouring cerebrals, thus from $\hat{\imath} d^{*}$ (to praise) we have $\hat{\imath} t t \hat{e}^{\prime}$ (he praises) from $\hat{i} d .+t e ̂, a ̂ i d d h v a m$ (ye praised) from aid + dhvam; ganṭ (calculation) from gan (to number) $+t i, g a n$ is a denominative derived probably from gana (a multitude) connected with Lith. gand (satis), ganau (pasco greges), according to Bopp, but it is better to treat gana as for garna from I. E. gar (to collect) when à $\boldsymbol{\gamma} \boldsymbol{\varepsilon} i \rho \omega$; phânta (easily

[^109]prepared) from phan (to produce easily) $+t a$; tad dayanam (this flight) for tat d., tân dindimân (these drums) for tân d., \&c.

Finally, we find a great number of words where cerebrals have arisen from dentals without any apparent reason, and of many of which we still find side-forms in Vedic still preserving the original dentals. Thus we have Vedic bhanati (he praises) beside Skr. bhan (to speak), Bühler identifies bhan with $\phi \omega \nu$ - $\epsilon \boldsymbol{\omega}$, but wrongly, as $\phi \omega \nu \epsilon^{\prime} \omega$ is from $\phi \omega \nu \eta^{\prime}=\phi \omega+\nu \eta$ and $\phi \omega=$ Skr. bha; pan and pan (to praise), \&c.

We may conclude then that cerebralisation is a phenomenon that has arisen within the limits of the Sanskrit language, and that it is not due to Dravidic influence. In the course of time this predilection for cerebrals grew rapidly stronger, till it produced the results that manifest themselves so plainly in Prakrit.*

In English the original dentals have all become cerebrals, as we see from the transliteration of English words into the various languages of India. Thus in Tamil îsttar is written for Easter, kôrttu for court, portt for fort (initial $f$ always becoming $p$ in Tamil), advans for advance, kalaktar for collector, tesṭu for test, \&c. In Telugu, likewise, we have kallataru for collector, daktar for doctor, agashtu for August, \&c. These examples completely prove that the English pronounce $t$ and $d$ as cerebrals, and not as dentals. In other European languages we likewise find cerebrals developed, as in schtehen, the High German form of the classical German stehen. In schtehen, however, Bühler believes that the sound of the $t$ is not quite so hollow as that of the Indian $t$, because the G. sch is not pronounced so far back in the mouth as the Indian sh.

The German $t$-sounds accordingly differ from the English $t$-sounds in this, that the former are pure dentals, while the latter are pure cerebrals or linguals.

[^110]
## ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA.

Page 12, line 20, for Inez, read Inez.

- 34, - 33, for 131, read 110, seq.

36, _ 12, for bhugh, read bhagh.
$41,-23,24$, for datrnâm, read dâtṛnâm.

- 48, - 5 , for $m r s^{\prime}$, read $m r s^{\prime}$.

49, - 33, omit A.
$52,=26$, for tubhyan, read tubhyam.
59 , - 25 , omit Burrus (= Пúppos).

69, - 1, for $\dot{\delta} \delta$, read $\mathrm{i} \mathrm{\delta}$.

- 70, - 14, after aspect, insert unless the dangers of the sea are supposed to arise from shoals.
- 73, - 2, for ghrana, read ghrana.
- 125, 34 , omit Consult Appendix B.
- 128, - 24, for krs a, read kṛs a.
- 141, - 24 , for spies, read spiess.
- 143, - 34, for as, read just as.
- 146, - 24 , omit only.
-147, - 5 , for mefiai, read mefia ${ }_{2}$.
- 159, - 6, 8, for Zeud, read Zend.
-163, —14, 22, omit in line 14, "Sestius beside Sextius, mistus beside mixtus ; sescenti for sexcenti;" and insert these words in line 22 , after " in."
- 179, - 9, for when, read whence.
$-186,-21$, omit ' ${ }^{\prime}$.
-189, -17 , omit §. 99.
- 190, - 6, for gak $k^{\prime} h$-ati, read gak $k^{\prime} h$-ati.
- 193, - 24 , omit §. 98 .
- 195 , - 27 , for $d r s$, read $d r s^{\prime}$.
- 198, - 10, for bharanta-s, read bharant-s.
- 199, - 29, omit §. 103.
- 202, - 24 , for $-a$, read $-\bar{a}$.
- 208, - 36, for $n^{\prime}$ artaka-s, read na'rtaka-s.
- 218, - 13, for bharat-i, read bharat-i.
- $219,-31$, insert rurudvat-su in the intermediate column.
- $220,-24$, for anadvầns read anadvầis.
- 226, - 2, 3, for have become, read are.
- 227, - 29 , for krt, read krt.
- 229, - 30, for tudátsi, read tudátsu.
- 232 , $\quad 10$, for from, read by.
-232, - 22, for $\pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma 0$, read $\pi \tau \dot{\eta} \sigma \sigma \omega$.
$-240,-18, a d d$, after $\dot{\text { o F }} \alpha \rho$, " or rather ou $\rho=$ Skr. svasâr (sister), men originally having to marry their sisters."
$-243,-18,19$, for conguis, read congius.
$-244,-29$, for $t$, read $r$.
-249, -29, for 廿ú $\alpha \xi \xi, \psi v \lambda a \kappa, \operatorname{read}$ фú $\lambda a \xi, \phi \nu \lambda a \kappa$.
- 250 , - 8, for Eolic, read Argive.
$-250,-23\}$ for In $\sigma$-stems $\sigma$, read In $\sigma$-stems the nominatival $\sigma$.
- 253, - 4, for hasticapas, read hosticapas.
- 292, _ 10, for pitrn, read pitr $n$.
- 295, $\quad 23$, for $a v y^{\prime} \hat{a m}$, read $a v y$ - $\hat{a m}$.

305, _ 18, the reference belongs to peptimo, and not to proximo-.

- 308, - 24, 25, omit "fur I. E. - an becomes -a in Greek."
- $320,-20$ for nasturtuim, read nasturffum.
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[^0]:    * For further information on this subject the following works may be consulted :-"Essentials of Phonetics," by Ellis; Max Müller's "Survey of Languages," also his "Lectures on the Science of Language," Second Series; Lepsius' "Standard Alphabet;" "Grundzüge der Physiologie und Systematik der Sprachlaute," by Brücke; "die Lehre von den Tonempfindungen," by Helmholtz; also various articles, by Ebel and others, in Kuhn's Zeitschrift.

[^1]:    * These terms will be explained farther on.

[^2]:    * These terms will be explained further on.

[^3]:    * See Brücke in K. Z. vol. xi., p. 265.
    $\dagger$ In this section I have followed Brücke very closely. .

[^4]:    * Consult a paper by Lepsius in K. Z. vol. xi., p. 442.

[^5]:    * Consult a paper by G. Michaelis, in K. Z., vol xiii., p. 223.

[^6]:    * Curtius, "Grundzüge," p. 85.

[^7]:    * Consult Bickell in K. Z., vol. xiv., p. 425; and Grassmann in K. Z., vol. xii., p. 122.

[^8]:    * In the "Rigveda" the symbol $\bar{T}_{0}$ is employed to represent the $l$-sound, into which an older $\boldsymbol{d}$ is sometimes changed. This sound must have been either $d l$ or $l d$.
    $\dagger$ See Max Müller, vol. ii., p. 265, seq.; and Curtius, "Grundzüge," pp. 386, 527.

[^9]:    * According to Lottner, who compares Gr. $\delta \nu$ ó óos.
    † Consult Curtius, "Grundzüge," p. 375 ; and Grassmann in K. Z., vol. xii., p. 109.

[^10]:    * "Deutsche Grammatik von Dr. Jakob Grimm," vol. i., p. 584. Consult also "Gesammelte sprachwissenschaftliche Schriften" von Rudolph von Raumer, and Max Müller, vol. ii., p. 198.

[^11]:    * In these examples I have nearly always omitted the corresponding roots in Slavic, Lithuanian, and Keltic.

[^12]:    * Benfey deduces Skr. patrin (a mountain) and Gr. $\pi \varepsilon ́ \tau \rho_{0 \varsigma}$ from this root, remarking that in the old poetical language clouds and rocks are identified, and the clouds considered as wings of the mountains !

[^13]:    * By Max Müller, vol. ii., pp. 180, 181.
    † Curtius, " Grundzüge," p. 366.
    $\ddagger$ Max Müller suggests, as an explanation of these forms, that the Legions which colonized Dacia were raised in the Oscan and Umbrian districts of Italy, where $p$ represented the Latin $q u$. But, in addition to the obvious improbability of this account, it may be added that it does not

[^14]:    * Aasen's "Norsk Grammatik," p. 224.
    $\dagger$ Max Müller, vol. ii., pp. 176-178. Curtius calls this phenomenon Verwitterung, thus comparing it to the decay caused by the operation of the atmosphere.

[^15]:    * For the materials of sections 31 and 32 I am almost entirely indebted to the instructive articles of Lottner and Grassmann, in K. Z., vol. xi., p. 161 ; and vol. xii., p. 131.

[^16]:    * From the fact that this same root, meaning to bake, is found in Skr., Gr., and L., Mommsen appears to be mistaken in asserting that the Greeks and Latins did not practise baking till after they separated from the parent stock and from each other.

[^17]:    * $L$ is perhaps inserted in L. claudus, Skr. khôd (to be lame) ; Ir. glun, Skr. g'ânu; Ir. dluimh (smoke), Skr. dhûma.

[^18]:    * Max Müller assents to the first part of this derivation, and compares with it Gr. ßovitvpov, and Ir. bleachd (milk) for bo-leachd, but he connects $\lambda a \kappa \tau$ with Skr. rag'as (a clear fluid). The Homeric $\gamma \lambda a ́ \gamma o s$ would then be exactly equivalent to a Skr. gorag'as.

[^19]:    * See Ellis' "Phonetics," p. 56; and Max Müller, vol. ii., p. 142.

[^20]:    * Benfey explains the $s^{\prime}$ here by the assimilating influence of the following $s h$; but then how would he explain s'akrt, \&c.?

[^21]:    * The late Professor Siegfried derived from this root the Keltic datl (judicium), whence were borrowed, according to Lottner, E. tattle, G. tadel, the termination $-t l$ being $=$ Gr. $-\tau \rho o v$, L. - trum.

[^22]:    * $L$ does not exist in Zend. The Chinese, on the other hand, always use $l$ for $r$, as Eulopa for Europe, Killissetu for Christ, Jamelika for America. The New Zealanders have no l. They say Rota for Lot, Horomona for Solomon.
    $\dagger P$ here may represent an I. E. bh, if L. bibr, E. beer, be from this root. We have a trace of the $b$ in Skr. pibâmi (I drink).

[^23]:    * Dietrich, in K. Z., vol. xiv., p. 48.

[^24]:    * Dietrich, in K. Z., vol. xiv., p. 53.

[^25]:    * Consult Raumer, "Gesammelte sprachwissenschaftliche sclurften," p. 96 ; and Curtius, "Grundzüge," p. 370.

[^26]:    ＊Curtius，＂Grundzüge，＂p． 646.

[^27]:    * Curtius, " Grundzüge," pp. 161, 281.

[^28]:    * Curtius, "Grundzüge," p. 655.
    $\dagger$ Schleicher considers $\varepsilon \delta 0 \nu \tau \varepsilon s$ to be the participle of $\varepsilon \delta{ }^{\circ} \omega$, poetically used for ó óóvteg.

[^29]:    * Similarly in Spanish we have hijo = L. filius, heno = L. fenum, herir $=$ L. ferire, hacer $=$ L. facere .

[^30]:    * Max Muller (ii. p. 217), opposes this view, and connects Skr. bhram with Gr. фрi $\mu a \sigma \sigma \varepsilon$ ?

[^31]:    * Or $\delta_{\varepsilon} \lambda \phi i s$ may be the "voracious fish," as Skr. grah means "to seize."
    $\dagger$ Curtius, " Grundzüge," p. 420. $\ddagger$ Ibid. p. 425.

[^32]:    * See Max Muller, vol. ii., p. 502.
    † Ahrens "De Dial. Æol.," pp. 42, 256.

[^33]:    * Consult Curtius, " Grundzüge," p. 538 ; and "Tempora und Modi," pp. 92, 93.

[^34]:    * For additional examples consult Curtius, "Grundzïge," p. 559, seq., to whom I am chiefly indebted for the materials of this and the following section.

[^35]:    * The Vedic sthûras (nom. sing. masc.) is an adj. meaning strong; it never means a bull.

[^36]:    * Lottner considers $\tau$ in these cases to be the sign of a presential form, lost in Skr. but kept in Gr., Lat., and Lith.

[^37]:    * This is Corssen's view, but it appears to be only a theory invented to account for the fact that the third letter of the Latin Alphabet has a $k$-sound.

[^38]:    * Of course I mean the Italian, and not the English i.

[^39]:    * "Nam contra Græci aspirare solent, ut pro Fundanio Cicero testem qui primam ejus literam dicere non posset, irridet." Quint. "Ins. Or.," I., 4, 14.

[^40]:    * Pulmo is not borrowed from the Gr. $\pi \nu \varepsilon \varepsilon \dot{\mu} \mu \nu \boldsymbol{\nu}$; for, if it were, its genitive sing. would be pulminis ( $=\pi \nu \varepsilon v ́ \mu o \nu 0 \varsigma$ ), and not pulmönis.
    $\dagger$ Consult, however, "Gesammelte sprachwissenschaftliche Schriften," by Rudolph von Raumer, p. 93.

[^41]:    * In these cases $d$ was perhaps the original sound; for final $t$ in E. what, it, \&c., points back to a Skr., Gr., and L. d.

[^42]:    * The vowel ${ }_{\imath}{ }^{e}$ was perhaps equivalent to the Fr. é fermé. It is written $i$ on the Bantine Table, but in the National Oscan Alphabet its sign is $\mathbf{r}$.

[^43]:    * $R$, represented in the Old Umbrian Alphabet by $q$, and in the New Umbrian by $r s$, marks a peculiar change of $d$, and was probably a strong hissing $r$.

[^44]:    * The connexion of vêna (pleasant), an adjective applied in Sanskrit to the drink Soma, with oivos is very doubtful. I have already connected the latter with the root $v i$ (to bind), whence came vin (the vine), and L. vieo, vitis. Others treat oivos as a borrowed word, and connect it with Heb. yain, Ethiop. wain, (wine).

[^45]:    * In Latin the accent was originally placed as far back as possible. Consult Appendix B.
    + Fert may be the older form, as we find Ved. bharti (fert).

[^46]:    * Agrigentum is the accusative of 'Aкрáyas, and therefore must have been introduced at a time when the intercourse between Rome and Sicily was carried on without the use of writing.
    + Consult Corssen über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der Lateinischen Sprache, p. 39, seq.

[^47]:    * L. pius has been also connected with Skr. pîy (conviciari in dial. vêd.), Goth. fijan (to hate), E. fiend; L. piare is then explained to mean "to reconcile an enemy."

[^48]:    * It is better, however, to derive vidua from the R. vid (to separate).

[^49]:    * Kritische Nachträge zur Lateinischen formenlehre, p. 29.
    † Grundzïge der Griechischen Etymologie, p. 408.

[^50]:    * Benary connects L. ebur with Skr. ibha (an elephant), from which he also derived Gr. $\begin{aligned} & \lambda-\varepsilon \\ & \text { - } \phi a s \\ & \text { b }\end{aligned}$ by prefixing the Semitic article. Others derive
     called bos Lucas.

[^51]:    * Corssen (Kritische Nachträge zur Lat. Form. p. 33) connects bacca with Skr. pak' (coquere, maturescere), and considers bacca, therefore, to be for pacca. In no case, however, except in a few words borrowed from the Greek, does initial $b$ in Latin represent an I. E. $p$; besides, Skr. $p a k^{\prime}$ is connected with L. coquo, Gr. $\pi \dot{\varepsilon} \pi \tau \omega$, $\dot{a} \rho \tau 0-\kappa o ́ \pi-o s, ~ C h . ~ S l . ~ p e k a, ~(I ~ c o o k), ~$ Lith. kepu, and all these forms seem to point back to an I. E. kvakv. $B u c c a$ is also connected by Corssen with Skr. bukk (latrare, loqui); this is explaining obscurum per obscurius.

[^52]:    ＊As $f$ in O．L．fostis，\＆c．，became $h$ ，so L．$f$ becomes $h$ in Spanish，as hijo $=$ filius，\＆c．. Similarly in Irish initial $p$ is lost，as in athir $=$ L．pater， lán $=$ plenus，\＆cc．；$p$ in Irish probably became $p h$ ，then $h$ ，and finally disappeared．

[^53]:    * Multus may have originally meant "pounded," "ground into many small fragments;" and from this its ordinary meaning may have been de-

[^54]:    * Leo Meyer suggests that garrio is for garnio, from which latter he explains gannio (I yelp). Bopp considers garrio to be for gargio, beside Skr. garg' (clamare), but this is most improbable.

[^55]:     $\pi \varepsilon \lambda \iota o ́ s, \pi \varepsilon \lambda o ́ s$, Skr. palita (grey). Now, if $l l$ (in pallor) $=l v$, we have a trace of a more intimate connexion between Latin, Lith. O. H. G. \&c., than between Lat. and Gr.

[^56]:    *Aspiration is of common occurrence in the Keltic languages. In Welsh $r$ and $l$ aspirate a succeeding consonant as in march (a horse) $=\mathrm{Ir}$. marc. In Irish $c, t$ and $p$ are aspirated between two vowels, as $e c h$ (a horse) for $e c u$, and this for ecus $=\mathrm{L}$. equos, O. S. ehu, \&c. Similarly initial $p$ disappeared, as in athir $=$ L. pater, $i a s c=$ piscis, lán $=$ L. plenus, \&c. $; p$ here passed through the stages $p h, f, h$, and then vanished as in L. faedus $=h a e d u s=a e d u s, \& c$.

[^57]:    * Consult Schleicher, Compendium, \&c., pp. 203, 235, 289, 308, 321, 335.
    $\dagger$ Consult Leo Meyer, Comp. Gram. I. 281.

[^58]:    * Curtius compares to this change the substitution of $\beta$ in Greek for a Græco-It. $v$, as in $\beta$ ov́ $\lambda o \mu a \iota$ beside L. volo, \&c. Consult his Grundzüge der Gr. Etym., p. 516.

[^59]:    * Luscus properly means " blind of an eye," hence " dinisighted," and luscum never means "twilight," consequently the proper translation of the word would be " the dimsighted songstress."

[^60]:    * Benfey connects invitus and inoito with Skr. vî (to desire), and Corssen (Kritische Nachträge zur Lateinischen Formenlehre, p. 52, seq.) supports the same view. Corssen connects vito with Skr. vî (to throw), whence a participial stem vita-may be formed meaning "removed, placed at a distance," beside which he also places O. H. G. wït (far off), G. weit, the $t$ of suffix, Skr $t a-$, L. to-, being unchanged in German, an exception to Grimm's law.
    $\dagger$ Perhaps musca has merely arisen from mucsa by transposition.

[^61]:    * Frugi meant utilis; Qui frugi homines xpךбípovs appellant, id est tantummodo utiles ; at illud est latius (Cic. Tusc. III. 8, 16). Ulfilas translates Gr. $\dot{\omega} \phi \phi^{\prime} \lambda \iota \mu \circ \varsigma, \varepsilon v ̋ \chi \rho \eta \sigma \tau o \varsigma$ by Goth. bruks. In the expression homo frugi, frugi can be only a genitive like nihili, nauci, flocci, pensi, \&c., but whether it be the gen. of a noun in -um or -ium cannot be decided. Consult Corssen, Nachträge, \&c., p. 83.

[^62]:    * Consult Corssen über Aussprache, Vokalismus und Betonung der Lateinischen Sprache, p. 49.
    $\dagger$ Bimus may be for bi-amnus, c. f. sol-emnis.
    $\ddagger$ Uxor has also been connected with Skr. uksh (to sprinkle), whence Skr. ukshan (a bull).

[^63]:    *Re-div-ivus is explained by some as meaning " shining again," from

[^64]:    * Some separate L. lupus from Gr. $\lambda \dot{\text { v́cos, }}$ and connect it with Z. $u$ -rup-is, raop-is (a species of dog), from root rup or lup (to tear). The Sabine irpus bears a great resemblance to the Zend words. It is not clear whether this group of words is connected in any way with Gr. $\dot{\alpha}-\lambda \dot{\omega} \pi-\eta \xi$, Lith. lápėe (a fox), lapùkas (a young fox).

[^65]:    ＊This is Curtius＇explanation，who translates dhâ by G．thun，E．do ： Kuhn explains svadhâ to mean＂selbstsetzung＂from dhâ（to place） $=$ Gr．$\theta_{\varepsilon}$ in $\tau i \theta \eta \mu \iota$ ．

[^66]:    * This does not happen when the aspirates belong to different roots or different suffixes, or when one belongs to a root and another to a suffix, or when more than one vowel intervenes between the groups of conso-
     $\tau \eta \lambda_{\varepsilon} \theta \alpha \dot{\omega} \omega$ from R. $\theta a \lambda$ for $\theta a \lambda \theta a-\omega$, an irregular reduplicated form like $\phi^{\ell} \rho-\beta-\omega$ from R. $\phi \varepsilon \rho=$ Skr. bhar and $\phi \varepsilon \in-\beta-\rho \mu a t$ for $\phi \varepsilon-\beta t-$ opat from R. $\phi t$ $=b h i ̂$ (to fear), \&c.
    † Consult Bopp’s Sanskrit Grammar, p. 343 seq., and Grassmann in K. Z., vol. xii., p. 111.
    $\ddagger$ Lottner considers daridrâ to be a reduplicated form of I. E. dar (to tear).

[^67]:    * Leo Meyer, Vergleichende Grammatic, \&c., vol. i., p. 323, seq.

[^68]:    * These forms are perhaps only presential bases.

[^69]:    * Curtius, Grundzüge, \&c., p. 62.

[^70]:    * In these Greek works, however, $\pi$ may represent an older $k v$, as we find in Latin torqu-eo, torc-ulum.

[^71]:    * Curtius zur Chronologie, \&c., p. 220.

[^72]:    * Consult Curtius, zur Chronologie, \&c., p. 223, whom I have here closely followed.

[^73]:    * Consult Curtius zur Chronologie der Indo-germanischen Sprachforschung, pp. 214, 222.
    $\dagger$ I have here followed chiefly Schleicher's arrangement ; see his Compendium, p. 518.

[^74]:    * We also find in Vedic a nominative plural, both masculine and feminine, in -âsas where â is common to both genders, e. g. dhûmâsas (masc.) from St. dh $\hat{u} m a$ (smoke), yag'ñ̂sas (masc.) from St. yag'na (a sacrifice), púvakâsas (fem.) from pávakâ (pure).

[^75]:    * Schleicher considers that neither $\bar{\imath}$ nor $\bar{u}$ existed in Indo-European, and consequently that we cannot speak of I. E. stems in $\bar{\imath}$ and $\bar{u}$. This is a question upon which it is difficult to pronounce a decided opinion, on account of the conflicting evidence, and it may consequently be considered at present an open one.
    $\dagger$ The usual form of this stem is g'ará ; g'aras is defective in those cases, whose case-endings do not begin with a vowel.

[^76]:    * The stems of $\lambda_{\dot{\varepsilon} \omega} \omega \nu, \theta \varepsilon \rho \dot{\alpha} \pi \omega \nu$, \&c., are $\lambda_{\varepsilon} \rho \nu \tau, \theta \varepsilon \rho a \pi o \nu \tau, \& c$. , of which the termination -ovi is = I. E. vant. The Greek feminines in -aıva $=-a \nu y a$, and the Sanskrit ones in -vatî, therefore point back to an I. E. fem. term. -vantî, or else these different feminine forms were developed independently after the separation of Greek from Sanskrit. It is even possible that the Greek form is older than the Sanskrit, and that the Skr. $\hat{\imath}$ is =I. E. $-y$ ă.
    $\dagger$ Bopp (Sanskrit Grammar, p. 144) adduces as additional proof of the connexion of Gr. $-i \delta$ with Skr. $-\hat{i}$, the fact that the accent in many Sanskrit feminines in $-\hat{\imath}$ changes in the same way as in many Greek feminines in $-\iota \delta$ : thus we have Skr. kalmashí' (nom. fem. variegated), nartaki" (nom. fem a dancer), Gr. $\dot{\eta} \mu \varepsilon \rho i \varsigma, \kappa a \pi \eta \lambda i \varsigma, \& c$. , all oxytones, beside Skr.
    

[^77]:    * This is the same pronominal root that appears in Skr. sya-s (he), syâ (she), tyat (it). With this pronoun Bopp connects the Old High German and Anglo-Saxon article; see his Sanskrit Grammar, 3rd Ed. p. 176.
    $\dagger$ Consult Curtius zur Chronologie, \&c., p. 253.

[^78]:    * Bopp (Sanskrit Grammar, p. 135), illustrates the change of the labial media in this word into the dental media by the Dor. óisdós = úpè ós. $^{\text {s. }}$

[^79]:    * For the special euphonic laws of Sanskrit, consult Bopp's Sanskrit Grammar, pp. 36-68, or Max Müller's Sanskrit Grammar, pp. 9-59.
    + Such feminine stems are very rare, and generally occur at the end of compounds, for the feminines of changeable stems are formed by adding $i$ to the weak stem.

[^80]:    * For exceptions to this rule consult Max Müller's Sanskrit Grammar, p. 81.

[^81]:    * Zend, as well as Greek and Latin, keeps the strong stem all through the declension of participles in -ant; in some words we find traces of the weak stem, as in Z. bereressant (great) = Skr. brhant, the dat. of which is bĕrésaitê and the gen. berrěsató from the weak stem bĕrěsat, while the acc. is berrésanterm from the strong stem.

[^82]:    * In Vedic we find mahâm (acc. sing.) for mahûntam. Bopp compares to this rejection of $n t$, that of $\nu \tau$ in the Greek participles $\tau \dot{v} \psi \bar{\alpha} \varsigma$, " $\sigma \tau \bar{\alpha} \varsigma$, and he considers $\mu \bar{\varepsilon} \gamma a \varsigma$ to be for $\mu \varepsilon \gamma \alpha \nu \tau \varsigma$, a similar participial form; he alse accounts for the short $\check{\alpha}$ in $\mu^{\prime} \gamma \breve{\alpha} s$ by supposing that its participial origin had been so long forgotten by the Greeks that they shortened the $\alpha$.
    $\dagger$ This stem comes from ar (to go) and vant (possessed of), the horse being so called from his speed : similarly Skr. as'va-s (a horse) $=$ Gr.
     む́rús, \&c.; E. horse has also been connected with Skr. k'ar (to move), L. curro, though it seems better to connect it with Skr. hrêsh (to neigh), and to look upon it as an onomatopeeic word. L. armentum is perhaps connected with Skr. arvant.

[^83]:    * For the special rules respecting all Sanskrit Vocalic stems consult Max Müller's "Sanskrit Grammar," pp. 96-115, and Bopp's "Sanskrit Grammar," pp. 109, seq.

[^84]:    * Consult Ahrens "De dialecto Dorica," p. 241.

[^85]:    * Consult Ahrens de Dialectis Eolicis et Pseudæolicis, pp. 120, 236.

[^86]:    * For further particulars as to forming the nom. sing. in Sanskrit, consult §. 104, and §. 107-113; also Bopp's and Max Muller's "Sanskrit Grammars."

[^87]:    * Consult Bopp's "Comparative Grammar," vol. I., p. 418, and Bopp's "Sanskrit Grammar," p. 93.

[^88]:    * Consult Bopp's "Sanskrit Grammar," p. 97.
    $\dagger$ The sound of the Anunâsika is represented by $\bar{n}$.
    $\ddagger$ We also find in Vedic as acc. s pl. madhu, vâri.

[^89]:    * So E. with has both these meanings, as in "I went with him," and "I cut the bread with a knife." See Schleicher, "Compendium," \&c. p. 577.

[^90]:    * Consult Schleicher, "Compendium," \&c., p. 587; and " Grundriss der lateinischẹn Declination von Franz Bücheler," p. 66.

[^91]:    * Consult Curtius "Zur Chronologie der Indogermanischen Spachforschung," p. 255.
    $\dagger$ Benfey's Practical Grammar of the Sanskrit Language for the use of early Students, §. 237, p. 197.
    $\ddagger$ Consult Bopp's "Comparative Grammar," vol. I., pp. 347, 348.

[^92]:    * In Sanskrit, Greek, and Latin, we find the suffixes, Skr. -tas, Gr. $-\theta \varepsilon \nu, \mathrm{L} .-t u s$, employed to form adverbs with an ablative meaning, and which in some cases actually take the place of the ablative, especially in the pronominal declension. Thus in Sanskrit we have svarga-tas (from heaven) from svarga, ku-tas (whence) from $k u=k v a$ (who), itas (from here), also used as abl. of id-am (n. this), \&c. The Skr. pronouns of the 1st and 2nd pers. attach -tas, not to the true stem, but to the abl., as mat-tas, tvat-tas. In Latin -tus corresponds to $\mathrm{Skr} .-t a s$, as in coeli-tus, \&c. This termination has also a locative meaning in Latin, as in in-tus, sub-tus. The Greek $\theta \varepsilon \nu$ is from a different root; for Gr. $\theta=\mathrm{Skr} . d h$, and not $t ; \pi \delta \delta-\theta \varepsilon \nu, r_{o}^{\prime}-\theta \varepsilon \nu, \ddot{\delta}-\theta \varepsilon \nu$, do not therefore correspond exactly to Skr. $k u-t a s, t a-t a s, y a-t a s$, but would require such forms as $k u-d h a s, \& c$. We find -dhas, however, in Skr., adhas (down), with which Benfey connects Gr. ${ }_{\varepsilon}^{\tau} \nu-\theta \varepsilon \nu$. We also find the exact representative of Skr . -tas in Gr .
    

[^93]:    * The lengthening of -os here is analogous to the lengthening of as in the gen. sing. of Skr. feminine stems in $-\hat{u}$, $-\hat{\imath}$, and $-\hat{u}$.

[^94]:    * Bücheler, " Grundriss der latcinischen Declination," p. 30, seq.

[^95]:    * Consult Bopp's "Comparative Grammar," I., p. 490 ; and Bücheler "Grundriss der lateinischen Declination," p. 40.

[^96]:    * Domus was originally an $o$-stem $=$ Gr. $\delta \delta \dot{\mu} \boldsymbol{s}$.
    $\dagger$ Lottner agrees with Siegfried's view that the suffixes -mem, -fem originally began with $m b h$; see Siegfried's remarks on the Gaulish inscription of Poitiers, arranged and edited by C. F. Lottner.

[^97]:    * Consult Bopp's "Comparative Grammar," vol. r., p. 400, seq.
    $\dagger$ Consult Schleicher, "Compendium," \&c., p. 573 ; and Bopp, "Comparative Grammar," pp. 494, 545.

[^98]:    * The declension of the adjectives has been already noticed in Chapter vIII., and consequently we have here only to do with the degrees of comparison.

[^99]:    * From this form is probably derived the Modern Greek comparative
    

[^100]:    * For the declension of the Sanskrit numerals, consult Bopp's "Sanskrit Grammar," pp. 157-161.
    $\dagger K a$ - (one) is found, according to Bopp, in L. cocles (one-eyed), from $c a$, and oculus and cacus = $c a$-icus, from $c a$ and a supposed ocus (eye), whence oculus, a diminutive; and in Goth. halta- (lame), from $h a=\mathbf{I}$. E. ka, and lith (to go); halba-(half), from ha, and leiban (to remain); haihs (one-eyed). Curtius connects L. caccus and Goth. huihs with I. E. root skia to shade) ; whence Skr. k'hâyâ for skâyă, Gr. бкı- $\alpha_{\text {, }}$ бко-ıá ( $\sigma \kappa о \tau \varepsilon \iota \nu \alpha ́$,
     considers to be a diminutive from the same root.

[^101]:    * In Sanskrit the pronouns in their acc.s. pl. asmân, yushmân, and their Vedic nom.s pl. asmê, yushmê, appear to be masculine in form. In the White Yag'ur-Veda (XI., 47)' we find a remarkable exception in the fem. acc. pl. yushmâs.
    + Consult an Essay by Dr. C. Lottner, "On the Forms and Origin of the Pronouns of the First and Second Persons," in the Transactions of the Philological Society (1859, Part 1.).

[^102]:    * I prefer to connect immo with the superlative stem imo- for immo$=i n-m o-$.
    † Diez, "Grammatik der Romanischen Sprachen," vol. I., pp. 199, 357.

[^103]:    * $\Sigma \phi$ in these forms implies an original $s v$, which may represent an I. E. $t v$.

[^104]:    * Curtius, "Grundzüge der Griechischen Etymologie," p. 477.
    † Schleicher, "Compendium," \&c., p. 644.

[^105]:    * The neuter termination - $m$, which is used as masculine and feminine in $\operatorname{ayam}$ (m.), iyam (f.), and aham, dates from a time when the distinction of gender had not yet been developed.

[^106]:    * Consult Bopp's "Kritische Grammatik der Sanskrita-Sprache," pp. 60, 61.

[^107]:    ＊Curtius deduces these Greek words from a R．F $\lambda$ or $F a \lambda=$ I．E．val or $v a r$, whence Skr．ûrmi－s（a wave），Gr．$\grave{\lambda} \lambda \hat{v} \omega$（I roll），o $\hat{v} \lambda a i ́(u n g r o u n d ~ b a r l e y), ~$ $\ddot{\partial} \lambda \mu \mathrm{os}$（a mortar，a round stone），$\dot{\alpha} \lambda o \alpha ́ \omega$（I thresh），$\dot{a} \lambda \omega \dot{\eta}$, Att．$\ddot{\lambda} \lambda \omega \varsigma$（a thresh－ ing floor），$\mu a ́ \lambda \varepsilon v \rho o \nu(=a ̈ \lambda \varepsilon v \rho o v, ~ H e s y c h) ~ f r o m ~ F. a \lambda \varepsilon u \rho o \nu, ~ \& c ., ~ L . ~ v o l v o, ~ G o t h . ~$ valvjan（to roll）．The final sound in Gr．＇ं̀v－，L．volo－，Goth．valv－is a short－ ened form of reduplication；the $F$ is represented by $o$ in òdooirpoxos（a rolling stone）$=\dot{\delta} \lambda$ Foır poxos，and in $\dot{\alpha} \lambda o \dot{\alpha} \omega=\dot{a} \lambda F a \omega$ ．We find similar cases of short reduplicated forms in Greek，as $\phi o ́-\beta-o-\varsigma, ~ \phi ́ ⿱ 亠 䒑-\beta-о-\mu a \iota$ beside Skr．bhît（timere）， $\phi^{\prime} \rho-\beta-\omega$ ，beside $\phi^{\prime} \rho-\omega$ ，Skr．bhar，$\pi o ́ \rho-\pi-\eta$ beside $\pi \varepsilon \rho-a ́ \omega$, L．por－ta，\＆c．

[^108]:    * Bopp ("Gloss. Comp. Ling. Sanskr.," p. 238) suggests that pâra may come from para (alius).
    + Bopp connects k'anda with Goth. hata (I hate).
    $\ddagger$ There are some exceptions to this law; from St. mrsh (enduring) we have $m r k$ (nom. sing.) $m r g b h i s$ (instr. pl.), \&c.

[^109]:    * According to Benfey, $\hat{\imath} d$ is a denominative verb based on ish (to wish, chose), and accordingly it is for isht $=i s+t$; compare Gr. iorns, " $\mu$ हpos (?) from same root. In the Vedas we find $\hat{\imath l}$ for $\hat{i} d$, , as in tvam . . . . martasa îlatê (te homines celebrant) ; consult Bopp's "Skr. Gloss.," p. 48. It is possible that $\hat{\imath} l$ is the original form, and that $\hat{\imath} \boldsymbol{l}$ is derived from it, as we frequently find $d$ representing $l$ in the Romance languages, as in Sardinian pedde from L. pellis, poddhige from L. pollex, casteddu from L. castellum, and Sicilian cavaddu from L. caballus, beddu from bellus, \&c.

[^110]:    * For further information on this subject, consult C. Lassen's most valuable work " Institutiones Linguæ Pracriticae."

